DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 686 HE 002 852

TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Association of Graduate Schools (11th, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 2-4, 1969).
INSTITUTION	Idaho State Univ., Pocatello.
PUB DATE	May 69
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; *Professional Education; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This is the report of the 1969 annual conference of the Western Association of Graduate Schools. The first general meeting held at the conference presented 3 speeches by minority students from the area graduate schools. Discussed in these addresses were the problems confronting the American Indian, Mexican American, and black students as students in the schools. The second general session of the conference dealt with the question of whether or not the graduate school is a threat to undergraduate education. In the 2 addresses presented at this session it was established that graduate education is not only not a threat, but that undergraduate education has never been better. The third session presented addresses that pointed out the pros, cons, and institutional barriers to urban action programs within the graduate school. The fourth session presented remarks concerning the professionalization of graduate education, and the fifth session dealt with the changing expectations of graduate students. The sixth and final session was a business meeting at which new officers were elected and various resolutions made. (HS)

ED 059686

Proceedings
Western Association of Graduate Schools

Eleventh Annual Meeting
March 2—4, 1969
Las Vegas, Nevada

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 852

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

PROCEEDINGS

Eleventh Annual Meeting

March 2-4, 1969
Las Vegas, Nevada

Conference Theme

RELEVANCE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION: THE GRADUATE SCHOOL UNDER FIRE

"Both as a center of scholarship and as a training ground for teachers, the American graduate school appals its critics and disappoints even its strongest supporters. Its antique and inflexible Ph.D. requirements discourage many able students and warp the attitudes of those who survive them. Its narcissistic professionalism stifles creative and socially relevant scholarship it might produce." Jencks and Riesman, The Atlantic, February 1968.

"The National Security Council advises that:

--It is not essential for the maintenance of the national health, safety and interest to extend student deferments for graduate study to fields other than medicine, dentistry and the allied medical specialties, where deferment is now required by Selective Service regulations." Higher Education and National Affairs, February 16, 1968.

"in a CBS-TV interview (Feb. 20), Gen. Hershey said he doubted the NSC ruling would have a serious impact on colleges and universities. He said that not all teachers need to have a Ph.D., and that Thomas Edison and Henry Ford 'did a lot' with almost no formal education." Higher Education and National Affairs, February 23, 1968.

Published

by

Idaho State University Press

May 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS *i*

ASSOCIATION OFFICERS *iii*

PAST PRESIDENTS *iv*

DATES AND PLACES OF ASSOCIATION MEETINGS *iv*

INDIVIDUALS IN ATTENDANCE *v*

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *H. W. Magoun*
Theme: *SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS*

"SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS" 1
Michael H. Trujillo, Graduate Student
University of New Mexico

"SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS" 3
Guillermo Martinez, Graduate Student
Fresno State

"SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS" 10
Virgil Roberts, Graduate Student
University of California, Los Angeles

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *Phyllis W. Watts*
Theme: *THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: A THREAT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 17
Phyllis W. Watts
Fresno State College

"REMARKS ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: THREAT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION?" 20
Bowen C. Dees
The University of Arizona

"REMARKS ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: A THREAT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION" 24
Richard Jones
Reed College

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *Charles G. Mayo*
Theme: *URBAN PROBLEMS: THE DEMAND FOR GRADUATE-LEVEL ACTION AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS*

"REMARKS ON URBAN PROBLEMS: THE DEMAND FOR GRADUATE-LEVEL ACTION AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS" 29
William May
University of Southern California

"THE CASE AGAINST URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS" 33
Emil Lucki
San Fernando Valley State College

"INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS TO POSITIVE RESPONSES TO THE DEMAND FOR URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS" 36
Philip M. Rice
Claremont Graduate School

"MODELS OF RESPONSE TO DEMANDS FOR URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS" 39
Lawson Crowe
University of Colorado

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *Ralph W. Gerard*
Theme: *THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 45
Ralph W. Gerard
University of California, Irvine

OPENING REMARKS 46
Joseph L. McCarthy
University of Washington

OPENING REMARKS 48
Wesley P. Lloyd
Brigham Young University

DISCUSSION 49

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *Wendell H. Bragonier*
Theme: *CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENTS*

"CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS" 55
William J. Burke
Arizona State University

"CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENTS" 59
Ellery M. Matthews
General Manager of Las Vegas Division
E. G. & G., Inc.

"CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENTS" 61
James Ragin
Colorado State University

"CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF BLACK GRADUATE STUDENTS" 64
Ernest Patterson
University of Colorado

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: *Wytze Gorter, University of Hawaii*
President, Western Association of Graduate Schools

BUSINESS MEETING 69

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS
of
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

ALASKA

University of Alaska

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
Northern Arizona University
University of Arizona

CALIFORNIA

California State College, Fullerton
California State College, Long Beach
California State College, Los Angeles
Chico State College
Claremont Graduate School
College of the Holy Names
Fresno State College
Humboldt State College
Immaculate Heart College
Loma Linda University
Loyola University of Los Angeles
Mount St. Mary's College
Occidental College
Sacramento State College
San Diego State College
San Fernando Valley State College
San Francisco College for Women
San Francisco State College
San Jose State College
Stanford University
United States International University
United States Naval Postgraduate School
University of California at Berkeley
University of California, San Francisco Medical Center
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine

CALIFORNIA (cont.)

University of California at Los Angeles
University of California at Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of California at Santa Barbara
University of the Pacific
University of Redlands
University of San Francisco
University of Southern California

COLORADO

Adams State College
Colorado School of Mines
Colorado State College
Colorado State University
University of Colorado
University of Denver
Western State College

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

IDAHO

Idaho State University
University of Idaho

MONTANA

Montana State University
University of Montana

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
New Mexico State University
University of New Mexico
Western New Mexico University

OREGON

Oregon State University
Portland State University
University of Oregon
University of Portland

UTAH

Brigham Young University
University of Utah
Utah State University

WASHINGTON

Central Washington State College
Eastern Washington State College
Gonzaga University
Pacific Lutheran University
University of Puget Sound
University of Washington
Washington State University
Western Washington State College

WYOMING

University of Wyoming

CANADA

ALBERTA

University of Calgary

BRITISH COLUMBIA

University of British Columbia

OFFICERS for 1968 - 1969

WYTZE GORTER University of Hawaii	President
GEORGE P. SPRINGER University of New Mexico	President-Elect
WESLEY P. LLOYD Brigham Young University	Past President
ALBERT E. TAYLOR Idaho State University	Secretary-Treasurer

Additional Members of the Executive Committee

H. W. MAGOUN University of California at Los Angeles	Member-at-Large
PHILIP M. RICE Claremont Graduate School	Member-at-Large

OFFICERS for 1969 - 1970

GEORGE P. SPRINGER University of New Mexico	President
PHILIP M. RICE Claremont Graduate School	President-Elect
WYTZE GORTER University of Hawaii	Past President
ALBERT E. TAYLOR Idaho State University	Secretary-Treasurer

Additional Members of the Executive Committee

HAROLD F. RYAN Loyola University of Los Angeles	Member-at-Large
WENDELL H. BRAGONIER Colorado State University	Member-at-Large

PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE ASSOCIATION

YEAR	*DEAN*	*INSTITUTION*
1958-59	Stuart Hazlet	Washington State
1959-60	Herbert Rhodes	University of Arizona
1960-61	Luther Lee	Claremont Graduate School
1961-62	Robert H. Bruce	University of Wyoming
1962-63	Milton Kloetzel	University of Southern California
1963-64	James Brown	San Jose State
1964-65	Henry P. Hansen	Oregon State
1965-66	George C. Feliz	San Francisco State
1966-67	Thomas D. O'Brien	University of Nevada
1967-68	Wesley P. Lloyd	Brigham Young University
1968-69	Wytze Gorter	University of Hawaii
1969-70	George P. Springer	University of New Mexico

DATES AND PLACES OF ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

(Preliminary planning meetings were held at Sante Fe, New Mexico, in 1957 and at Denver, Colorado, in 1958.)

1st	March 29, 1959	Lake Arrowhead, California
2nd	February 29, 1960	Berkeley, California
3rd	February 27, 1961	Phoenix, Arizona
4th	March 5, 1962	San Diego, California
5th	February 25, 1963	Reno, Nevada
6th	February 24, 1964	Albuquerque, New Mexico
7th	March 2, 1965	San Francisco, California
8th	February 28, 1966	Tucson, Arizona
9th	March 6, 1967	Honolulu, Hawaii
10th	March 4, 1968	Denver, Colorado
11th	March 3, 1969	Las Vegas, Nevada
12th	1970	Seattle, Washington (planned)
13th	1971	Long Beach, California (planned)

ATTENDEES
at the
ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING
of
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

Las Vegas, Nevada
March 2-4, 1969

ADAMS, Charles L.	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
BIELLA, Arnold	
BIGGS, Millard	San Diego State College
BORGERSON, John N.	Humboldt State College
BRAGONIER, Wendell	Colorado State University, Fort Collins
BROWN, Giles T.	California State College, Fullerton
BROWN, James W.	San Jose State
BRUCE, R. H.	University of Wyoming
BURKE, William J.	Arizona State University
CASTLEBERRY, Donald	San Francisco State College
CHASE, John L.	U. S. Office of Education
CROWE, Lawson	University of Colorado
DEES, Bowen C.	University of Arizona
EVERS, Nat H.	University of Denver
FOSTER, Larry L.	San Francisco State College
GARDNER, Eldon	Utah State
GERARD, Ralph	University of California, Irvine
GOERING, Ken	Montana State University
GORTER, Wytze	University of Hawaii
HANSEN, H. P.	Oregon State University
HATCHETT, S. C.	National Institutes of Health
HORUDA, Joseph S.	University of the Pacific
JACKSON, M. L.	University of Idaho
JOHNSON, Frank	University of Utah
JONES, Richard	Reed College
JORDAN, A. R.	Colorado School of Mines
KEHOE, Joseph A.	University of Portland
KELLY, W. C.	National Research Council
KITZHABER, Albert R.	University of Oregon
KRAMER, Howard D.	National Science Foundation
KRAMER, Robert C.	California State Polytechnic College

LARIMER, Dale E.	Adams State College
LEMME, Maurice M.	San Diego State College
LLOYD, Wesley	Brigham Young University
LOVE, Hazel E.	University of California at Los Angeles
LUCKI, Emil	San Fernando Valley State College
MAGOUN, H. W.	University of California at Los Angeles
MALCOLM, David	Portland State
MARTINEZ, Guillermo	Fresno State College
MAURER, Robert L.	California Polytechnic, Pomona
MAY, William	University of Southern California
MAYO, Charles	University of Southern California
MCCARTHY, Joseph L.	University of Washington
MCMURRIN, Sterling	University of Utah
MELOM, H. A.	California State College at Long Beach
MERRITT, C. B.	University of Arizona
MILLER, Wilbur C.	University of Denver
MINTER, W. John	Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education
MOYE, Anthony L.	California State College at Los Angeles
MOYLS, Ben	University of British Columbia
NEVÉ, Richard A.	Central Washington State College
NYMAN, C. J.	Washington State University
O'BRIEN, Thomas	University of Nevada, Reno
PATTERSON, Ernest	University of Colorado
PEARCE, Roy	University of California, San Diego
RAGIN, James F.	Colorado State University, Fort Collins
REYNOLDS, Art	Colorado State College, Greeley
RHODES, H. D.	University of Arizona
RICE, Philip M.	Claremont Graduate School
RIPLEY, Helen	U. S. Office of Education
ROSENHAUPT, Hans	Woodrow Wilson Fellowships
ROSS, Alan	Western Washington State College
RUCKER, W. Ray	United States International University
RYAN, Harold F., S. J.	Loyola University of Los Angeles
SHACKLETT, Robert L.	
SHAO, Otis	University of the Pacific
SISTER Gerald Shea	Immaculate Heart College
SISTER Regina Clare	Mount Saint Mary's
SNYDER, Patricia O.	Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education
SPRINGER, George P.	University of New Mexico
STAUFFER, Paul	Loma Linda University
STEWART, John	University of Montana

TAYLOR, A. E.	Idaho State University
THOMPSON, Emmett	Sacramento State College
TRUJILLO, Michael H.	University of New Mexico
TYLER, Leona E.	University of Oregon
UMBACH, William E.	University of Redlands
WATTS, Phyllis	Fresno State College
WHITFIELD, Ray	Eastern Washington State College
WOOTTON, Donald M.	Chico State College

Monday, March 3, 1969

Opening of the Eleventh Annual Meeting: *Wytze Gorter, President*

Welcoming Remarks: *Donald H. Baepler*
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: H. W. Magoun, University of California at Los Angeles

Theme: "Special Treatment of Minority Groups"

address: *SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS*

by: *Michael H. Trujillo*
Graduate Student - Biology
University of New Mexico

Believe it or not, I'm an American Indian (I forgot my feathers). I was first invited here by Dean Springer, who said he was supposed to bring an American Indian, and I was his American Indian in Graduate School. The problem of my coming here was I had never been involved in any political atmosphere of minority movements. Immediately when I entered the University I felt a distinct difference; I entered a large institution in which I knew no one at all; I came in to the large lecture rooms, and I would sit down; and, as the students filed in, most of the time I would be left with four or five seats around me empty. And as a young student and a little emotional in this time, I began to wonder: is it me, or is it them, or what do I do? Do I make any attempt to come forward? I tried several times to make acquaintances, but it seemed as though I had not broken an emotional barrier which I had felt myself as different. I think this is one of the main problems of my cultural group, my people that I come from. The pueblo from which I originate is Laguna Pueblo around about sixty-five miles west of Albuquerque. They have the largest industry of mining there in uranium, and have, because of their investments, established scholarships for young Indian students of their tribe. When I first started out in college there were sixteen of us who applied for the scholarship. All sixteen of us got the scholarship which financed our first years in college. Of the sixteen, four of us graduated. The majority of the sixteen dropped out within the first semester, and by the second semester there was five or six of us left in the colleges. Those who did succeed have gotten through the University. . were those whose parents had some educational background. My parents, my father has his work on his Ph.D., and my mother has her college education, and they are teachers. Another student, her parents live in Albuquerque . . . and she was not associated at all with any of the Pueblo culture as such. Another Laguna student was going to the University of Pomona, and he had never really belonged to the Laguna tribe. Those who had come from the reservation had for some reason failed to complete the university curriculum. I think this an extension of my own personal problem, although I was involved in the Anglo culture as a young boy and, being initiated, I can now speak the English language because my mother and father are from different linguistic groups, so they always spoke English, and as a result, I learned English. With this problem of communication, we all feel indifference which is intensified by the educational system in itself--the lecture system--a large body that extenuates the difference in any group who feels themself a minority already. I was given an advisor in my college. He also had about fifty or sixty other advisees, and with him I never had any personal communication. He never presented me with a feeling of wanting to understand me as a person, as if my cultural group, or what I am, or what do I have to offer; but rather as another student, another ordinary student, who had come in. The feeling that I got was that I was an American-Indian, and all Indians are the same. This is not true. I think there has to be some type of guidance through which a student can be made to feel he has something to offer, something of personality, something of his own cultural background. There, at the present time, is the growings of these, as is the need. There are demands for your black studies and for other cultural studies to be initiated into the curriculum. But those who succeed enter the government, enter the graduate school, are those people who have already come through the first two years of college and essentially the beginning years of education in which there is laid a foundation of your viewpoint to a society, your viewpoint towards other people, and how things are taught to you. I was always reading history books, one of my hobbies. Now I was always fascinated by the idea of General Custer's massacre, such-and-such a general's massacre, and so on and so forth, and the great battle of Wounded Knee. Indians are always being chased for some odd reason; they're always being killed. I never heard in great length the story of our exploits, why we were fighting, of any viewpoint of the other side, the other cultural group. The history and the teachers that taught me this had a viewpoint of the white Anglo society. I had no relevance, I could not relate other than maybe it was this way when I was small, but there is something wrong because teaching in this way, you tend to forget your own cultural identity, begin to question yourself as to whether: Is my cultural group anything worthwhile? And with me, when I went into high school, I began a period of rejection of my own cultural group. I didn't want anything to do with it. I tended to, when I went back to the reservation, not want to be associated; I felt as though I was being brought down to a different cultural level, which is not so. I am very, very proud of the Indian in me, and I would not be anything else; but the period of initiation in the beginning years was a questioning of whether my cultural group was worth anything at all. Around two months ago I was down at my sister's house watching TV, sort of babysitting with my little nephews and nieces. They're full-blooded Indians. They can also talk the Indian language. But my little niece was patting my little nephew who was crying very much. She said, "Don't worry, Johnny, don't worry, there's no Indians here." We were watching a cowboy and Indian show, and the Indians were being chased, and they were getting back at the Calvary, who were in a little circle. It's funny, it's ridiculous, to see how far (although I am black, I am brown), how much I have left behind of great value which I have lost, and will be lost for me because I cannot ever go back to things of my childhood which I should've gained. There was a period of complete withdrawal, of questioning, which was given to me by my educational system. I had no connection with it so that when I got to the University, I was already indoctrinated, I suppose, into the culture. I felt ostracized. I had no feeling of identity, no wanting to be within the University atmosphere other than within the courses. I felt rejected, and I felt depressed, but I continued going. There has to be some type of guidance given to each individual student, as a person. Studies programs should be initiated, some type of intercollegiate program should be started with people--graduate students, or students of those who are most active. Inter-areas of discussion such as this, you cannot say, "Well, graduate schools should lay out such-and-such a plan, one, two, A, B, C, and this is what we want." Each school is different. There has to be room for maneuverability and concessions on both sides, I believe; but there has to be basically an understanding that each cultural group has something great to offer, and these should be initiated into the college curriculum as programs of study. And if they are not initiated into the curriculum, somehow brought into the University life so that each individual student can have an opportunity to experience what other students of other minority groups have to offer. There has to be some sort of interchange.

address: *SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS*

by: *Guillermo Martinez*
Graduate Student - Foreign Languages
Fresno State

I am not a spokesman for the Chicanos. I am only pointing out some observations. I will try to give you another perspective. How you use it depends on your commitment to humanity.

Suppose that you are a traveler from outer space. You land on earth. Everything has been devastated by some final war. You wander about, looking. Finally you find a trap door leading down into the ground. There you find an underground library--left there for posterity. You are that posterity.

Curious, you pull a book down from a shelf. That book you select is about Mexican Americans, written by a social scientist. You begin to read. Interesting. Strange. Intrigued, you read more about Mexican

Americans, more books by social scientists from the same shelf. You read Tuck, Griffith, Saunders, Clark, Edmonson, Rubel, Heller, Madsen, Lander, Kluckhohn. By the time you finish reading these books you have come to two conclusions: (1) earthlings used social science to "explain" history, and (2) Mexican Americans had virtually no history to speak of, trapped as they were in their isolated traditional culture, an ahistorical process to begin with.

The first conclusion is correct. The second is not. Here's why.

The social concept of traditional culture is a passive concept--scientifically, philosophically, and empirically equipped to deal with human beings only as passive containers of culture. In this country, all social science studies of Mexican Americans have blindly relied upon this totally passive concept of traditional culture in order, to (1) describe the foundations of Mexican American culture, (2) to "explain" the existence of Mexican Americans over time, and (3) to use the idea of traditional culture as a final cause of empirical life. For these reasons, social science studies have dealt with Mexican Americans as an ahistorical people--with a place in history reserved for them only when they undergo some metamorphosis usually called acculturation. As a consequence, Mexican Americans are never seen as participants in history, much less as generators of the historical process. Some one hundred years ago, New Mexico's senator, Theaddeus Stevens, said of the native New Mexicans, "A hybrid race of Spanish and Indian origin, ignorant, degraded, demoralized, and priest-ridden."

Recently, William Madsen, an anthropologist, said of the Mexican Americans, "Mexican Americans caught in the middle of the conflict between two cultures may react in one of several ways. Some retreat to the security of the conservative Mexican American world. Some seek geographical escape into the twilight zone of alcoholism. Some rebel and commit crimes or engage in antisocial behavior. As their numbers increase, more and more acculturated Mexican Americans are trying to create for themselves a respected place embracing the best of both worlds."

According to Madsen, Mexican American culture represents a retreat, whereas acculturation represents creativity and change. It is with bi-polar dichotomies such as this that the notion of the passive traditional culture is perpetuated. Contrary to the ahistorical views of anthropology and sociology, Mexican Americans as well as Mexican immigrants have not simply wallowed passively in some teleological treadmill, awaiting the emergence of an acculturated third generation before joining in the historical process. For example:

1. In 1883 several hundred cowboys in the panhandle went on strike, and this strike call was signed by a man named Juan Gómez.

2. In 1903, over 1,000 Mexican and Japanese sugar-beet workers went on strike in California. This was followed

by a wave of strikes in Los Angeles, initiated by Mexican railway workers.

3. In 1922 Mexican field workers sought to organize in Fresno: this effort was followed by the formation of a large union La Confederación De Uniones Obreras in southern California during 1927.

4. In 1930, some 5,000 Mexican field workers were on strike in the Imperial Valley.

5. In 1933, the largest agricultural workers' strike to date in California took place when 7,000 Mexican workers walked out of the onion, celery, and berry field in Los Angeles county.

These upheavals, paralled with non-agricultural strikes, virtually continuous from the turn of the century until World War II, were only the major events which took place in California. These, however, were not the only efforts made by Mexicans and Mexican Americans. During the thirties, for example, workers of Mexican descent were striking in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Michigan, as well as in California--that is, in eight different states of the union.

The growing labor movement involving Mexicans and Mexican Americans was met with massive military counter-action in order to break the strikes. Massive deportations followed, even though the unrest continued.

Then, in 1946, after decades of widespread and constant turmoil and upheavals followed by military action against demands for a better life, a sociologist named Ruth Tuck made the following statement: "For many years, the (Mexican) immigrant and his sons made no effort to free themselves. They burned with resentment over a thousand slights, but they did so in private . . . perhaps this passivity is the mark of any minority which is just emerging . . ." (p. 198).

Thus, in one semantic stroke, this sociologist wiped out the decades of strife in which Mexican immigrants and their sons fought to free themselves. In effect, Tuck wiped out history.

Ruth Tuck's opinion of a population that does nothing but "burn with resentment privately" became the dominant view of Mexican American character in the literature of the social sciences. Scarcely eight years later, for example, the sociologist Lyle Saunders wrote, "A closely related trait of the Spanish speaking people is their somewhat greater readiness toward acceptance and resignation than is characteristic of the Anglo. Whereas it is the belief of the latter that man has an obligation to struggle against and if possible to master the problems and difficulties that beset him, the Spanish speaking person is more likely to accept and resign himself to whatever destiny brings him." (p. 128).

Saunders' "study" was quickly followed by another equally distorted interpretation, Munro S. Edmonson's Los Manitos, a New Mexico study. Here the perverted litany continues when he states that ". . . fatalistic acceptance of things which 'just happen' are a source of wonder and despair to Anglo housewives with Mexicano servants, but they are a precise expression of the Mexic attitude. . ." He goes on to say, "Hispanos give a characteristic shrug of acceptance of death and illness as inevitable." (p. 60) These absurd statements are not enough for Edmonson, he has more. Hispanos have no "individual responsibility" in sexual relations (60), perhaps they are like cats and dogs, whereas Anglo sexual practices provide "rational" alternatives. It goes on, but finally, ". . . where Hispano culture is fatalistic, American culture is markedly activist." (p. 61) In this simple little phrase, like Tuck and Saunders before him, Edmonson cleanly wipes out hisotry and simultaneously classifies these people in New Mexico as basically un-American. This is a theme that is encessantly recurrent in all of the social science literature on Mexican Americans. It is an ideological precursor to the current un-American charges leveled against the Tijerina movement in New Mexico today.

From Edmonson's 1957 "study" it is an easy jump to Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodbeck's 1961 report that, conceptually, is the exact mirror image of Edmonson publication. The Kluckhohn-Strodbeck section on Hispanos in New Mexico is based upon a sample of twenty-three in a community of 150 people. Then this minute sample is used to describe Mexican American and New Mexican value orientation for the past 400 years!

But, one might say, these are "old studies"--the latest of them published in 1961. Fortunately we live in a nation dedicated to "progress". Obviously, then, such stereotypes of Mexican Americans have been corrected in the intervening years--thanks to science which is the handmaiden of progress. Let us turn to two widely circulated current studies of Mexican Americans: The Mexican Americans of the South Texas by William Madsen (1964), Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads by Celia Stopnicka Heller (1968, third printing).

Madsen's Mexican Americans. "In our melting-pot process, there is a willingness to accept foreign holidays, foods, and some expressions of speech. However, it is assumed that every acculturated American shares certain core values with the rest of the population. His behavior must be comprehensible and predictable in most situations. Every American is expected to show maximum faith in America, science, and progress (p. 1).

Once again we see the un-American theme which appeared in Edmonson's publication. The obvious implication, of course, is that because Mexican Americans are so resigned, then all salvation must come from without.

There is more. Mexican Americans ". . . regard envy as a destructive emotion and admit that it is a major barrier to the material advancement of la raza. Envy is felt to be such a powerful emotion that it is difficult or impossible to suppress." (p. 22) "While the Anglos try to keep up with the Joneses, the Latins try to keep the Gracias down to their own level." (p. 22) "They accomplish this through gossip, ridicule, withcraft, and fear." (p. 22-23)

What Madsen has said, of course, is that Mexican Americans are the generators of their own problems. Consequently, they are their own worst enemies. This is all a part of their traditional culture which they learn from their parents. Therefore, their parents are their own worst enemies.

To summarize Madsen's views, due to their culture Mexican Americans are the generators of their own problems. This impedes their material advancement. Therefore, today they are just as they have been; they will not progress until they change completely. Thus, Madsen has equated economic determinism with cultural determinism, just as Oscar Lewis has done. Finally, Madsen has made Mexican American culture the final cause of all of the problems that Mexican Americans have encountered throughout history.

Celia Stopnicka Heller opens her book with the following introductory statement: "The Mexican American minority has received little attention from the mass media of communication and, outside the southwest, there is hardly any awareness of it existence . . . Moreover, in those southwestern states, where they are concentrated, an awareness exists but there is no corresponding knowledge about them. Of course, few people in those states would admit ignorance and more would vouch that they 'know all there is to know' about Mexican Americans. The 'all' very often consists of a stereotypic image of Mexican Americans that is widespread. I have heard numerous comments which reflect it. The comments about Mexican American youth in particular--made even by individuals having contact with them, such as teachers, school administrators, and social workers--run something like this: How 'Mexican' the young people are in their ways, how lacking in ambition, how prone to delinquent behavior. Even for the person who is not satisfied with those stereotypes, it is not easy to obtain factual information." (p. 3-4)

As we shall see, Celia Heller is more than well satisfied with 'those stereotypes', almost exhuberant--adding some of her own to boot. Her starting point, as in other books, is the traditional culture of the Mexican Americans. First, Mexican Americans are not quite Americans, or, in her words, 'among the least Americanized'. (p. 4) In this one phrase she suggests that there are immutable and inconvertible criteria that define what an American is, which, as it turns out, is something that Mexican Americans are not. If, then, Mexican Americans are not Americans, what are they? This question poses absolutely no problem to Miss Heller, for, wouldn't you know, Mexican Americans are really all alike. Know one and you know them all, as we say. Or, to put it in her own words, Mexican Americans exhibit a 'marked lack of internal differentiation' and therefore constitute an 'unusually homogeneous ethnic group.' (p. 15)

"Mexican Americans, she goes on to say, have a language problem with a 'foreign' accent often persisting to the third generation" (p. 30), "their progress is retarded because of their large families" (p. 33), "and they manifest an unusual persistence in traditional forms." (p. 34) "All of this makes for a socialization process in Mexican American families that is not conducive to advancement." (p. 34) This is especially true since "parental indulgence hampers the son's need for achievement." (p. 37) Then she sums it up by saying, "This lack of emphasis upon 'making good' in conventional terms is consistent with the theme of fatalism and resignation which run through Mexican American culture." (p. 38)

In less than forty pages, then, this sociologist has said that Mexican Americans are not Americans, that they are all virtually alike, that they tend to speak with a foreign accent, that they are held down by their own families, that their sons are helpless victims of parental indulgence which retards them, and that they are fatalistically resigned to this cultural miasma. Miss Heller is just warming up. She then goes on to add that Mexican Americans are also characteristically lazy and somewhat irrational about it all. In her own words, "the combination of stress on work and rational use of time . . . forms little or no part of the Mexican American socialization process." (p. 38) Due to their parents' and their parental culture, therefore, Mexican Americans learn 'lax habits,' have no 'habits of self-discipline,' because they are "vigorously trained to be dependent people." (p. 39) All of this would not be so bad if only Mexican Americans would only try to think for themselves. But, this is not the case for "Few Mexican American homes stress higher education." (p. 39) In fact, they don't even stress "intellectual effort." (p. 39) What is a major consequence of all this Mexican American cultural persistence? Criminal behavior!!

You will recall Heller's introductory comments in which she decried the stereotypes about Mexican Americans held by teachers, school administrators, and social workers. This disclaimer did little, if anything, to conceal the fact that she actually expanded the existent stereotypes to the lazy, ahistoric, somnolent, childish, and criminally intent Mexican--giving such dehumanizing views a spurious legitimization by calling the social science. But neither the crocodile tears of her disclaimers, nor the false mask of scientific procedure, conceal the fact that Heller's book is one of the most vicious in existence today. It is vicious because it classifies millions and millions of people as being virtually all alike, just as Adolf Hitler classified millions of people twenty-eight years ago as being all the same--calling them the progenitors of all of their own problems--problems which were said to be the direct consequence of their own history, a history which, in Hitler's eyes, was also a traditional culture.

All of these perspectives might have been true and might still be true of some Mexican Americans and Mexicans. But they are no longer true of the Chicano. What has happened is a real confrontation of the Chicano within himself and his society. This is the essence of what is happening in the southwest.

This self-examination has revealed to the Chicano a link with the past and a link with the future. A future with validity. A future where Chicanos are the agents, the creators, the builders of their own destiny. This we call self-determination. It's implementation we call the movement. Our determination we call la causa. Our benefactors we call la raza. The agents are militant.

The Chicano has shown its face. He has shed the servant mentality and denied the validity of the psychology of the master. He no longer shuts away from the stranger.

His intimacy is no longer revealed exclusively in fiestas, alcohol, or death, but in confrontation with the master.

He has removed the mask, of which Octavio Paz speaks, and seen himself for what he is--a human being. He is creating new relationships by destroying and by modifying old ones. He no longer seeks to escape from himself by forgetting his condition and his link with the past. He continuously reminds himself of that condition by calling himself a Chicano.

He refuses to live alone, that is without witnesses, he lives now with his witnesses la raza. He dares to live with himself in solitude and with his fellow human beings. He confronts society but he also recognizes it in lieu of the poor, the weak, and the oppressed. In short the Chicano really is a cultural revolution.

Whether you accept it or deny is irrelevant. We recognize that this change is an ordeal. And agony for some of you, but it is an ecstasy for most Chicanos. But, nevertheless it's an ecstasy that the Chicano has embraced with the passion of life itself. In short, he dares to be a human being in an age of infra-humanity, and robots; he will not tolerate dehumanization by anyone or anything any more.

One question that might wrongly lead us or guide us in the development of programs for Mexican Americans in the educational system is: What are the consequences that the Mexican American child or student suffer in choosing between assimilation and non-assimilation? In my view the question should be why force the child or student to assimilate? Why? Why do you want to inmasculate or to reinforce his inmasculation in terms of assimilating Mexican Americans into a middle class bag? A bag which needs much to be desired, this is to put it mildly.

This cultural revolution that I have spoken to you about is an attempt to create a social order that will not be violated by an oppressor. In a wider sense it is an invitation to communion. For we are a people of communion as Paz points out. Such a social order must permit each man to express himself and to realize his value. We must free ourselves completely from the restricted philosophy of the proper chain of command, status according to title, or worth according to salary, and so forth each of which is expressive of the heavy emphasis of the material over against the human, of the impersonal over against the personal, of the group over against the individual. This is what the Chicano stands for.

With these ideas in mind I might suggest a couple of programs for graduate schools.

1) A program such as that at Long Beach State. In this program a Chicano is hired as an instructor for the school but he only teaches on a part-time basis. The rest of his time is spent working toward a higher degree. That higher degree will validate him in the present school systems.

2) Own recruitment, own staffing, own curriculum.

There could be many other programs. Just one last point. All programs that relate to Chicanos should be developed in conjunction with la raza studies personnel. The reasons are abvious, I'll presume.

address: *SPECIAL TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS*

by: *Virgil Roberts*
Graduate Student - Political Science
University of California at Los Angeles

I think my colleagues have told you most eloquently about the problems of the minority student in graduate school and the problem of the minority student in undergraduate school. I would like to speak to you very briefly this morning about the problems of the black minority in school, about the desires, the needs, and the goals of the students for transforming the university into a type of institution that relates very specifically to the needs of black people. I think in order to understand the impetus of what's happening on college campuses today, it is necessary to paint a little bit of a background for you so that you can see the foreground a little bit more clearly. Many people today talk about the student movement, or the student revolt, or the black student movement, on campuses as though it is a new phenomenon, as though it is a phenomenon of school year 68-69. And I will contend that this is not so. I would say that the student movement had its beginnings in the late 1950's and early 1960's of the Civil Rights Movement. For those of you who remember the events of that time, the freedom rides, the sit-in movements, the demonstrations, the marching, for the most part were participated in by students. The sit-in movement, as a matter of fact, was started by students, started by students from a small negro college. What happened, then, is in the Civil Rights Movement students developed tactics, students began to see the methods of confrontation, students began to have the idea that by being active and participating in society, they could foment change. In 1963, the Civil Rights Movement came to a symbolic end with the march on Washington. Also in 1963 we had the first outbreaks of violence in the streets of Birmingham. I think it significant that immediately following that in 1964 we had the first outbreak of student activism and disorders on the campus at Berkeley in the free-speech movement. I think it is primarily a transformance of student activism from the streets to the campus. It was the students returning back to their college campuses and beginning to foment reform and action there as opposed to the greater society. So, you know, with this background, and of where student activism came from, is another important thing you have to understand. And that is the black consciousness movement and the black epitemological framework, as it now exists, is a direct outgrowth of politicalization that occurred during the Civil Rights Movement; it's a direct outgrowth of the fact that students learned that there were certain ways of transforming this society, and they also learned that the laws and many of the things that existed in this society existed to their detriment. And students began to feel, and black people began to feel, that the way to foment change, the way to make this a better society, was to move together, to move as a group, and to begin to respect themselves, to begin to determine their own destinies and to begin to defend themselves. So these became the three basic tenets of what many people call black power, but I prefer to call the black Consciousness movement: that is, self-respect, self-determination, and self-defense. Now, taking these three concepts and keeping them in mind, keeping also in mind the student activist movement, the other thing to keep in mind is the fact that students, black students--I think minority students in general--are concerned about transforming their communities to make their communities better places to live in. I think they're concerned about transforming their communities to make them more humanitarian places for their people to exist in. So, what you have then, is you have, like, a black epistimological framework, and it wants to use pragmatic methodologies to achieve humanistic goals; and this is something that is new in American society. American society has always used pragmatic methodologies, but also to achieve pragmatic ends. I think that there is also a differentiation here that could be made between the black activist and the white activist. I think if we look at history in terms of philosophical movements, in terms of philosophical frameworks, we can divide into three broad categories. The first one is that of the Cartesian man, Descartes' man: "I think, therefore I am." And all of you are, I am sure, aware of the age of Rationalism and how people, you know, were concerned about thinking in the age of Enlightenment. Following this we have the age of Pragmatism. It is mostly in America with: "I do, therefore I am." I make, I build, you know; we're building a society, and there were things in America like Manifest Destiny, and there were things around the run of the century about making education relevant to the needs of society, and doing things and building things. I think now we're moving into a new age, and it's an age in which white students are participating in (sic) which black students are not yet willing to participate in, and that age is the age of "I feel, therefore I am." And this age is most blatantly represented, I think, by the Hippie movement, whose whole goal in life is to love. His whole goal in life is to reject the materialism in society. The black student who exists and the minority student who exists in this type of melieu, then, is faced with two problems. One, he has to change his society--that's pragmatic: "I do, therefore I am." On the other hand, he's also living in an age that's changing, and says: "I feel, therefore I am." So what the student has got to do is he's got to use this pragmatic methodology to create a humanistic type of society to reach humanistic goals. Now the goals of the black student, I think the minority student, on campus can be enumerated. I think they're very simple, and I'd like, you know, to share my enumeration with you. I think the first goal, and far and away the most important goal, the transformation within the University is that minority students be allowed a part in the decision making power. I re-emphasize that. Minority students be allowed a part in the decision making power. Institutions of higher education in this society are probably, outside of the churches, the whitest institutions that exist. Administrators, the faculty, the curriculum, the libraries, the research emphasis, the programs--everything there--is taught and based upon a white value system. The reason for this is that historically the minority groups have been excluded. And being excluded means that they weren't able to voice their opinion. So in other words when we talk about students having power in the decision making process, it's not so much the students wanting to erode the power that existed in the institutions as it is students wanted to democratize institutions. For those of you who deal in social sciences, I think you are well aware that democracy is postulated on the assumption that people in groups will look out for their own welfare. People in groups will look out for their own welfare. That's the basis of one man, one vote. That's the basis of democracy: self-help, self-rule. What minority students, then, are asking for is the democratizing of the University. What we are asking for is the right to decide some of what goes on in the University. So that's one goal that's very important. Another goal which is less important, but very much related to the first, is a change in the curriculum of the University and colleges of this society. The changes in the curriculum are needed for a number of reasons. First of all, because minority groups have historically been omitted from the curriculum, there's a tremendous gap in the heritage and the culture of minority groups as it exists. The black minority, particularly in this country, is at an extreme disadvantage when it begins to operate in the area of trying to create group solidarity; because we have been cut off, our heritage has been ripped from us and willfully destroyed. Slaves, as those of you must know, were brought to this society that came from the same tribes were dispersed so that they could not communicate in their native language. The native religions were destroyed so that they could not maintain any institutions of their own. The family structure was destroyed so that the very basic unit of organization within society was destroyed. So all heritage and cultural background of the black minority is gone. That heritage, that background, is essential for people to have a feeling of group solidarity. That heritage, that background, should be and must be taught. In addition to that, the problems and needs of the black communities, of the Mexican American communities, the Indian communities, have not yet been defined. The problems of community organization, the problems of welfare--all these are substantial substandard type problems that have to be discussed in, like, a classroom type of situation, to begin to learn about the communities in a way in which they've never been learned about before. There have to be fundamental changes, then, at the graduate level in the curriculum. There have to be fundamental changes at the undergraduate level in the curriculum. In addition, the third goal must have more recruitment of minority faculty and students. This is essential to the implementation of the other two goals I have already mentioned. I think, first of all you need the faculty members because many decision-making processes on the University are predicated upon faculty members. Without black faculty members to participate in those decision-making processes, you have no one protecting the interests of the minority students of the minority group on cmapus. You've got to have the faculty members there. The other reason you need faculty members is to participate in, like, curriculum, that there aren't enough black professors around, there aren't enough black teachers around, and so eventually black students, Mexican American students, Indian students, have been coming to the realization that they're going to have to have white faculty members dealing with courses in the black studies program. I will maintain that the black experience in this society is an extemely unique experience. I would also maintain that because the experience is so unique, that it borders virtually on the impossible for someone to be able to relate that experience without having had that experience. I would, you know, I would give you an analogy, then, of the scientist who has spent his life studying the moon and reading about the moon, as opposed to an astronaut who's been to the moon. If you want someone to relate to you the experience of what lunar life is like, who would you turn to? I think the scientist who studies 240,000 miles away has one view; the person who's been there has another view. And I think if(sic) we're going to deal with the issues of minority programs, minority studies, in a very legitimate way we have to come to grips with the fact that those people who have the experiences are those people who must relate those experiences. Concommitant with that, then--with the introduction, then, of minority faculty members, minority students, into a campus situation--the curriculum problem begins to take care of itself because most faculty members teach those courses that are of interest to them. So if you have a minority faculty there, the existing curriculum you have if you have a class, say, in political parties, and you have a black political scientist there, he's going to do political parties as they relate to black people. If you have a white political scientist there, he's going to deal with political parties as they relate to the greater society. So it's extremely important that you begin to develop black faculty members, and that's where the black students come in, and that's where the other minority students come in. You have to begin to develop these students at the graduate level, and you need the professors there to help develop them. Another goal we have that is also interrelated is the change in the emphasis of research programs and projects. There is a tremendous need felt now on the parts of education at all levels to begin with minority existence and minority experience in this society, but there is also a posity of instructional materials that can be given to elementary schools, high schools, and even at the college level. These instructional materials must be developed; they must be developed at the college level. They must be developed by research. So that's one emphasis you have to have a change in--emphasis in research programs to begin to develop instructional materials that the society needs. The other emphasis, then, becomes that you have to have research programs, research projects, that relate to the needs and that will begin to come toward solutions of the problems that exist within the urban communities of our society. So that you have systems like welfare, and you take a city like Los Angeles, where 70 per cent of the people in south-central L. A. are tied in to the welfare system in one way or the other. That's a system that affects the lives of almost all the black people in south-central L.A., and yet the welfare system is, you know, I think patently lacking in many respects. So, then one of the research emphases, then, for, like, a school like UCLA, then, would be to go in and look at that welfare system, see how the resources that are allocated to that can be transformed to do the kind of job they should be doing. And that's the kind of research that we have to do. The final goal, then, I think, of the minority student is community involvement. We have in our communities a tremendous lack of leaders, we have a tremendous lack of people who can marshall the forces, and the resources, to do the work that needs to be done. Therefore, graduate students, professors, can almost not be afforded the luxury of teaching, can almost not be afforded the luxury of writing and being removed from being out in the street on the level, working and actively seeking change. Therefore, any graduate school program that deals with minority students will also have to make provision by letting those students be active in their communities, by letting those professors be active in their communities. So the community involvement, then, has to be involved. So those are, like, five goals. I think, you know, based upon those five goals, that each school can come up with individual programs to implement those goals. Now there's one thing I think I should discuss, and I think it's sort of a sidelight that directly relates, and that is the type of campus disorders that you get. And most of the campus disorders that result from minority students are directly around one of these five goals, if not all of these five goals. And I think what you have to realize is that campus disorders, campus riots, campus disruptions you have are a manifestation of the fact the goals have not been implemented and need to be implemented. We talk about a democratic society, we talk about participation in a democratic society. There are all different means of participation. For example, in an election, you can vote. However, on a college campus, minority members do not vote. I think if you walk through the administration halls of any university, you will see that the white constituency is always represented. Consequently, when you have a constituency that's not represented, it is then up to them to decide, to formulate, to structure, means of participation within that system. The only means of participation that now exists within the system (and this is very funny), the only means of participation which now exists within the system is to disrupt that system. That is the only way an input can be made. I think what you as representatives of various graduate schools must begin to realize is that unless these goals are started on the process toward being achieved, unless these goals are being implemented within the very near future, then you leave yourself open for the types of campus disruption that takes place. Therefore, I want to leave with you the thought and the need for implementation of these goals. I want you, too, to realize and remember what I said at the beginning about the background of minority students. Minority students come to your universities to learn. Minority students come to your universities to grab hold of knowledge that is relevant and needed by their communities. If you stop minority students from gaining that information, if you stop minority students from acquiring the tools they need to foment change, if you stand in the way of people attaining their self-respect, if you stand in the way of people determining their destinies, and if you stand in the way of people achieving their just and legitimate ends, then I think that you have to, you know, suffer the consequences of that stand.

DISCUSSION

Following the above presentations there were questions presented to the panel members concerning the general attitudes of minority groups. The members of this panel were in general agreement that most minority groups desire to retain their racial-cultural identity with full opportunity to lead the development of these cultures on an equal basis. They agreed that assimilation is not desired.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Phyllis W. Watts, Fresno State College

Theme: "The Graduate School: A Threat to Undergraduate Education"

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

by: *Phyllis W. Watts*
Fresno State College

Of course, we deans of graduate schools know in our secret hearts that the graduate school is really the raison d'etre for the university. However, we constantly hear that our schools constitute a serious threat to the undergraduate programs of our institutions, that we are crassly committed to a philosophy of grantsmanship and the pursuit of dollars and distinctions, that we run slave markets through which we corrupt undergraduate instruction by providing cheap labor, and that with our Lorelei song of privilege and prestige we lure mature scholars from the teaching function.

It is interesting to consider for a moment how young is this ogre we represent. As you all know, the first doctoral program in the United States was established only a little over a hundred years ago, in 1860, at Yale University; Harvard granted its first doctorate in 1873; the first separate graduate institution was, as you know, Johns Hopkins, established in 1876. Had the Johns Hopkins pattern been the one which caught on, our discussion today might have a somewhat different tone. Probably the clamour would be to share research grants with the undergraduate institutions so that they could afford the sophisticated equipment available only through this means and so that they could retain their mature scholars and not lose them to our institutions. They would probably be decrying the exodus of potential teachers of undergraduate courses and the resulting exhorbitant costs of undergraduate instruction; they would be decrying the fact that their new staff members with Ph.D.'s lacked skill in working with students--all in all, that they wanted closer relationship with the graduate schools. Instead, the complaint, as I read it, is that the graduate schools are seen as the tails wagging the dogs.

There is probably some truth to the current complaint. This newcomer to higher education has gained very rapid prominence. In 1890 there were under 2500 graduate students in the nation. Thirty years later, in 1920 enrollment had increased to something over 15,000. And only forty-seven years later, in 1967 it was 709,000. This is seven times as great a per cent of increase as occurred in the undergraduate program.

The intense focus on our program since sputnik and the resulting period of liberality with funds have placed us in a highly enviable position. For a time it seemed that we could do no wrong. We may have almost come to believe our press. When others protest that graduate education is a detriment to undergraduate education, we respond that the graduate programs bring in vast sums of money (sometimes more than the total normal budget for the institution), that graduate students provide the lower division instruction that the undergraduate program must have, and that fully qualified professors appear to consider to be beneath their dignity and competence, and that we provide it at less cost.

Perhaps the complaint against the graduate school has some relationship to the funding of higher education and the standard methods of achieving status. With a limited number of institutions receiving the bulk of federal grant money, is it not possible that there is also a concentration in these institutions of those experts whose major preoccupation is research--those who feel that the only students for whom they have time are graduate students whose labor can further their research? Among the multitude of other institutions who are seeking to break into the ranks of the prestigious funded few, are there possibly many who place too high a value on the ability to secure the grants that the institution must have to buy the frappings of prestige?

Possibly we are blaming the graduate school for a condition of which it is also the victim. With the great expansion of knowledge and the great complexity of the hardware now needed even for undergraduate courses, and with the spiraling costs of higher education, institutions are pushed into securing funds from whatever source they can. As a result, the man who can secure grants is much prized and his apparent unconcern for undergraduates is overlooked. Others see him as given prestige; it becomes "the thing" to scorn students--to view as wasted that time which is spent in teaching. Thus, the graduate school is blamed for professional scorn of the teaching function. With the research professor's preoccupation with matters other than teaching and the high salary he can command and with the graduate students' need to eat, it is logical for institutions to use graduate students for the undergraduate teaching function. Thus, we have the cry that professors research and consult; and graduate students teach. I submit that this is a figment of funding in higher education rather than an essential of the graduate school; it is the result of the relative value the institution and the public place on quality of instruction versus lucrative and prestigious research, and the extent to which the institution is or is not hardheaded in preservation of the teaching function.

A survey reported by Talcott Parsons in 1966 suggests that the professors themselves, even those whose prestige would permit them to devote their time exclusively to research, really prefer a balance between research and teaching.[1] (Of course in some instances they may mean teaching a few graduate students.) Possibly our detractors are overlooking the fact that the teaching function has changed. McKeefery has called attention to the complexity of the task of the professor in this day of expanding knowledge that forces him to depend on support staff and to function as a member of a team rather than as an individual.[2] Graduate students serve a particularly important function in this team and thus preserve--even improve--the quality of instruction.

In institutions which do not have completely separate graduate faculties, the graduate school provides the undergraduate faculty with research opportunity and the stimulation of teaching graduate courses; for example, 332 of the undergraduate faculty at my institution have load adjustments and more stimulating schedules as a result of the graduate program. Further, the graduate teaching assistantship program performs a role in preparing teachers for the undergraduate program. The national academy of sciences reports that 48 per cent of over 1700 doctoral recipients were, ten years later, at least partially engaged in teaching. With undergraduate institutions requiring vast numbers of new teachers each year, this preparatory role becomes extremely important. But somewhere along the line, we have failed to convince our colleagues in the undergraduate programs that we really are so valuable to them. We appear no longer to hold our privileged position. Perhaps we have stubbed our toes in communication, and perhaps in far more serious matters. Possibly what we need to do is take stock of what is happening, and assess the wisdom of our priorities and the patterns into which we have fallen. We have, therefore, asked two distinguished guests to discuss with us the graduate schools as threats to the undergraduate program. Perhaps they can help us to see wherein we fall short of all the good we think we are doing, and possibly they can point the way to what we might consider doing to improve our ways.

This session is planned with two twenty-minute presentations. So that all of you may be spokesmen for the graduate schools we shall then have twenty minutes for you graduate deans to engage these men in dialogue that together we may point a way for action.

---

[1] Talcott Parsons, "New Roles for Academic Faculties," in Current Issues in Higher Education, Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual National Conference on Higher Education, March 13-16, 1966, p. 93.

[2] William J. McKeefery, "The Impact of Effective Utilization of Faculty and Facilities on the Changing Role of the Professor," Ibid., p. 227.

address: *REMARKS ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: THREAT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION?*

by: *Bowen C. Dees*
Provost for Academic Affairs
The University of Arizona

As I begin these comments, it is with the impression that we are not likely to have very much debate on the fundamental question at issue, because we are almost certainly all convinced of the necessity of having both strong undergraduate education and strong graduate education in the universities of the United States.

Of course there are problems with respect to undergraduate education in our colleges and universities; but graduate schools and undergraduate colleges are and must remain dependent on one another. There is no way that we can have strong undergraduate education (over the long run) without having strong graduate education. There is no way that we can be as successful as we want to be with respect to graduate education unless undergraduate colleges do a good job with the students they send on to graduate study.

There are abroad in the land some "half-myths" relating to relationships between graduate and undergraduate education; I characterize these statements as "half-myths" because they have more than a little truth embedded in them--and we cannot afford to ignore the degree of truth they contain. Let me describe four of these half-myths that seem to me to be worthy of our consideration and our concern.

The first half-myth is this:

> Undergraduate education is rapidly going down hill; senior faculty members no longer teach undergraduates; only junior faculty members and graduate teaching assistants are involved in undergraduate instruction.

This half-myth is one which is probably the most widespread and at the same time the least accurate. Undergraduate education in the United States today is more rigorous, more "meaty," and (in its entirety) qualitatively better than it was twenty, forty or sixty years ago.

Much of the comment concerning the state of undergraduate education is based on a misreading of the historical trends in U. S. colleges and universities. It is true that many senior faculty members have done substantially less undergraduate teaching during the last decade or so than their counterparts did in (let us say) 1927 or 1935. In those earlier years the typical professor taught more at the undergraduate level and less at the graduate level; he had fewer graduate students to advise, and fewer obligations to help such groups as the Atomic Energy Commission or NASA or NSF in their review procedures or in the development of agency policy. What is often forgotten in this connection, however, when one hears the criticism that many senior faculty members do little undergraduate teaching, is the fact that there are now many more senior faculty members on virtually every university campus than there were in those earlier days.

Let me now turn to the second half-myth--which you will observe is very closely associated with the first. This myth holds that:

> Federal funds made available to universities have lured most of the able people away from undergraduate teaching into research and graduate education--particularly in the sciences.

Because most of the federal money made available to universities under the so-called project grant technique has been for research--more often than not involving graduate students--the direct impact of this support has been greatest at the graduate level. It is therefore claimed that the increased emphasis on research and the increased numbers of graduate students must have been at the expense of undergraduate instruction. There have been a few attempts made to get some quantitative evidence on this matter. A study* by Dr. Harold Orlans (published in 1962 by the Brookings Institution) has often been cited as proof that federal funds for research have badly damaged American undergraduate education (in science at least). However, in a general caveat in the introduction to that report, Orlans says:

> . . . it may be well to state firmly at the outset that in the judgment of the overwhelming majority of faculty and other institutional representatives, which we share, the over-all effect of federal programs at universities and colleges has been highly beneficial.

It seems to me that this statement is correct and that we should not only agree with what it says explicitly but with what it also implicitly indicates: that all parts of higher education have been benefited by the federal support that has been made available in recent years. The build-up of staff which has been made possible in some measure at least through the provision of federal funds has helped many departments to achieve "critical mass"--that level of staff size at which those kinds of interactions could be assured that are so very important to qualitative improvement at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Some of you no doubt will recall the series of hearings held under the chairmanship of Congressman Reuss of Wisconsin a few years ago. At that time, large numbers of individuals testified or sent in their comments on the impact of federal funds on their institutions. By and large, as a review of the published hearings would indicate, the individuals who presented points of view were careful to make it clear (as Orlans did in connection with his report) that the overall impact of federal support has been helpful. There were a number of people who pointed out, however, that the problem of assuring the right level and kind of undergraduate education is one that will have to be looked at still more carefully in the future if we are to make sure we do not put too much emphasis on research and graduate education to the detriment of undergraduate education. This is just another way of saying that myth number two has enough seeds of truth embedded in it that we must make very certain we do not allow these seeds to sprout and grow.

---

*The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1962.

The third myth has to do with the old but still current controversy concerning the manner in which the United States has chosen to train its college teachers. This myth holds that:

> There are much better ways of preparing college teachers than those we now employ.

I have been unable to find proof that this statement is correct. On the other hand, there are many evidences that the manner in which we have been training our college-level teachers works quite well in large numbers of cases. There are, to be sure, some interesting experiments going on right now with respect to this matter--and we may have evidence in a few years that this statement is factual. Eventually, we may learn how to go about educating those who are to be college teachers in a more thorough and a more effective manner. I know of no one who feels that we should stick with the traditional pattern to the exclusion of well-conceived efforts to improve it. Moreover, I am sure most people feel that we need to build into our graduate programs more flexibility--for college-teaching-bound students and others; but I would insist that the work done by Bernard Berelson, and reported in his book _Graduate Education in the United States_, was both sound and persuasive. You will recall Berelson pointed out that:

> The argument over the graduate school and college teaching is clarified by the arithmetic of the situation: the graduate school is increasingly producing for the university as employer--the research-oriented university--rather than for the college. Hence its research-oriented program of training is increasingly appropriate. The tide in American higher education is probably running toward the universities, not toward the colleges. If the case presented for more attention to the college's needs was not strong enough to carry the day three or four decades ago, it is weaker still today.

The fourth and final myth I wish to mention is this:

> Teaching is never rewarded as well as is research.

This may seem to some of you to be such a self-evident statement of fact that you will immediately claim it does not belong in my list. The statement is close enough to being true that I almost omitted it. The only reason I finally decided to include this fourth myth in my list is that there are some institutions where good teaching has consistently been well-rewarded all through the years. There are other institutions that have learned in the relatively recent past that it is important to pay more attention to good teaching and to reward it--and are now doing just this. Still other institutions (I am convinced) will soon develop better schemes for identifying and rewarding the good teacher. So, all in all, it is simply not true to say that teaching is never rewarded as research is. Having allowed this fourth myth to slip in only on a technicality, let me now put it in other terms: If we say teaching is too infrequently rewarded as well as research is, then we have transformed a half-myth into a truth; and clearly this is a problem which we all need to try to do something about. It hardly contributes very greatly to our present debate, however, because this statement can be thought of as being true for graduate school instruction as well as for undergraduate. Indeed it would be my guess that if we had a well-calibrated "instructometer" by means of which we could measure the quality of instruction in any given classroom, the needle would read "good" or "excellent" in a larger percentage of undergraduate classrooms than in either formal graduate courses or seminars.

Myth or fact, the four points I have been discussing are matters that need to be watched carefully. U. S. higher education is in pretty good shape, all things considered. There is substantial evidence that graduate education in this country has been rapidly gaining qualitatively (as well as quantitatively) in the last two decades. There is much strongly held belief on our campuses that undergraduate education has also been improving in quality despite all of the handicaps under which it has labored, and despite the general feeling that improvement could have and should have occurred on a wider scale and more rapidly. While the qualitative gap between graduate education and undergraduate education has probably grown wider in these years, this is not because the "absolute" quality of undergraduate instruction has deteriorated, but because graduate education has been outdistancing undergraduate education in the race for higher quality.

This analysis may be thought of by some as overly pessimistic and by others as overly optimistic. I think of it as justifying expressions of concern but not cries of alarm. We should not feel comfortable with the present set of circumstances, and we ought to work hard to make sure that the problems that we can see at hand or looming on the horizon do not become critical. I believe we can do the things necessary to improve undergraduate education without endangering continued progress at the graduate level. But we must turn our attention to this matter, and we have to reexamine a number of our points of view with respect to priorities over the next few years. This task is by no means insurmountable, and it is fortunately true that, if graduate education has in fact been receiving more than its fair share of attention, this will in itself help (as the feed-back process continues) to make undergraduate education better and to close any qualitative gap that separates the two areas of higher education.

address: *REMARKS ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: A THREAT TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION*

by: *Richard Jones*
Senior Professor of History
Reed College

It is by no means my opinion that the graduate schools have been responsible for the crisis, or even that they've been primarily responsible for it. As a matter of fact, it seems to me clear that the chief issue is that of the failure of undergraduate education in the United States for a long period of time to establish any kind of clear consensus or any kind of clear commitment with regard to what its objectives really are, and what function it truly serves. Now I won't quarrel with Dr. Dees that there has been, in certain kinds of measurable ways in the past ten or twelve years, an improvement in the quality of undergraduate education. Certainly it's been clear to me that there's been improvement in the quality of undergraduate students and in their degree of commitment to what they're doing. But I am talking about a situation in which it seems to me that for a long, long period of time the undergraduate college has suffered from engaging in practices which it has not cared to examine in terms of what the objectives really are, and whether or not the means employed contribute to the achievement of those objectives. I suppose it might be a subject for debate, but I'll take it as a given fact that a hundred years ago, that high education in America was, as has just been suggested, fundamentally undergraduate education, and in England it was education which had some kind of commitment to the development of the intellect. That is to say that it was designed presumably to train people in some way or another in the processes of critical, analytical thinking, and to train them in those processes with reference to the examination of subject matter as intensively as they possibly could, and as critically as they possibly could examine it. Now I don't know that it's true that the means employed, the traditional classical education, were at any time ever the best means to the achievement of those objectives. But I do know that the record is very clear that the means came to be the end, that to a very large degree, things were done, and have been done, and continue to be done, in undergraduate education--not because there is some clear notion that those things are the things which are best adapted to the production of training in clear, analytical, hard thinking, but rather because they've traditionally been done, rather because they're matters of habit. And thus it seems to me a long time ago the undergraduate educations lost their creative vitality. Now if I'm talking about the commitment to analytical and critical thought--I suppose another way in which that's often phrased is "the pursuit of truth"--and that is the function of the institutions of higher education: to engage in the pursuit of truth. If that can be defined in a certain kind of way, I think I'm prepared to accept it. That is to say that it seems to me that it's unlikely that in some final and ultimate sense any kind of institution that human beings can devise will produce a pathway to truth. But it does seem to me that it is also clear that what an educational institution can do is to provide the processes and develop the techniques by error; and obvious and manifest error can be identified and stripped away, by which (this I think is what gives rise to the phrase "liberal education", if it has any real meaning), by which individuals can progressively be liberated from the enslavement of authority (simply because it's handed down as authority), from the enslavement of prejudice, from the enslavement of superstition, and from the enslavement of, as I've suggested, identifiable error. Now that job of engaging in that kind of process, I think, was, or should have been, the special mission of the undergraduate college. Now it's quite clear that in addition to the sort of freezing of an undergraduate curriculum and the loss of vitality to which I've already referred, the undergraduate institution has been asked to do a lot of other things. It's been asked to provide a variety of kinds of vocational training. It's been asked to engage in the development of programs which presumably will qualify people well for graduate schools. And I guess at that point I can build the bridge to the effect of, and the impact of, the graduate school upon the undergraduate institution. Now it would be an exercise in egregious self-indulgence for me to attempt to lecture you on this impact. Most of the things that I would have to say have already been referred to, they're familiar to all of you. I think I simply want to remind you of them. That is to say that the graduate school has had the effect on undergraduate education of producing a brain drain that the whole society, the whole ultimate structure of higher education, has fostered, and created a condition which has established the prestige, and the rewards, and the significance for the individuals who have been engaged in, and who have been able to turn out, creative research (sometimes not very creative). But, in any event, that's where the emphasis has been, and that's what tends to be the emphasis--an emphasis imposed by the values of the system at large upon the individual institutions in which graduate and undergraduate education exist side by side. And, consequently, all of the pressures with which you are familiar are pressures which, from a professional standpoint, encourage the emphasis on the research rather than on the undergraduate teaching aspects of the collegiate experience or the university experience. Furthermore, of course, I think it's clear that the financial situation to which reference has been made is one which also operates to the detriment of the undergraduate institution in a great many more ways than perhaps have clearly been specified. That is to say we all know that graduate education is tremendously expensive. It's also true, of course, that the system of grants, and so on, has gone a long way toward helping to finance that graduate instruction; but generally speaking it's also true that graduate instruction over a period of a half century, or even less--of a quarter century, has come to occupy from the standpoint of per-student-hour-of-instruction a far more weighty place in the university budget than undergraduate instruction has done. Now this has two effects, it seems to me, and those effects, I think, are equally serious and equally important. One of the first ones is--and this is related to the brain drain to which I referred, and the degree of commitment--that faculty members in a university, due simply to the pressures of the many kinds of obligations which they are expected to fulfill, and which they professionally desire to fulfill (and those include, as has been suggested, attention to, and interest in, undergraduate teaching in most instances, as well as attention to the development of graduate education and the assistance provided to graduate students, and the development of a successful graduate program, and of the pursuit of their own personal research projects.) That means that probably the first thing that gets squeezed is not necessarily the attention to undergraduate classroom teaching on an individual basis. The first thing that gets squeezed is the commitment to the academic enterprise and the nature of the determination of policy within the academic enterprise. Because nothing is more time-consuming that the matter of giving consistent, and eternal, and vigilant attention to what kind of education goes on in general in the institution rather than what goes on particularly in your individual classroom. And yet if what I've been saying earlier is true about the degree to which undergraduate education has suffered from a lack of consensus, a lack of commitment to purpose, a lack of intensive examination and constant examination to determine whether or not in fact process and purpose are linked together, then this withdrawal of which I am speaking has very serious consequences indeed. What it means is, and you may not find this uncomfortable (although I suspect that most of you probably do)--what it means is that the job of policy making is turned over to specialists in policy making, to administrators who have to make the kinds of decisions with regard to what the college is all about, and how it shall go about doing what it is all about, that ought to be being made by faculty members. And the result of that, as I say, has been to increase and enhance this condition of withdrawal, of the lack of commitment to the general process, even among those who retain their own individual commitment to doing a good effective job in the undergraduate classroom. Now, the second of the effects (from the standpoint of the kinds of pressures related, more specifically, I suppose, in this case to finances) has also already been referred to, and that is the matter of the relationship of graduate instruction to undergraduate instruction in terms of the per-capita cost. And, as a matter of fact, regardless of the fact there are all over the United States, and in every one of your institutions, devoted teachers who are also involved in undergraduate education and research, but who are determined to fulfill some kind of obligation in respect to the undergraduate program, that that obligation must generally take the form not of individual advice to students--not of individual classroom instruction in small groups--but rather of appearance on the lecture platform. But with the bulk of instruction--personal instruction-necessarily being diverted to younger people, to graduate assistants, to new-comers into the profession (and this is despite any changes that may have taken place)--that is, as I think you are aware, pretty largely still the pattern. And I'd like to say here and now that it seems to me, and has seemed to me for a long period of time, that the whole structure of American higher education ought to be inverted, that the place where the best teaching is needed, the place where the most individual attention is required, is with the freshmen--the beginners--and from that on up; and that the place where the least individual attention, and the least effective instruction in terms of professional skills and long-term experience is required, is at the graduate level. And it turns out that it's the other way around. And the lecture method may serve, I think, as an example. I could cite a good many others, but it seems to me clear that by the time most students have progressed far enough in college to be in the upper division levels--certainly by the time they have entered graduate school--they have engaged for a long enough period of time in the study of the subject matters related to the kinds of things that they're involved in upper division class or in graduate school, that they can profitably listen to someone standing on a platform before a microphone expounding a particular position or explaining a particular problem. They can engage in that as you can, critically, so that it does in fact become not a one-way matter of somebody attempting to pour something out into empty heads, but rather the kind of thing that's telling, rather into the kind of thing that's involved in teaching--that is to say, two-way communication in which the audience or the group sitting before the lecturer is constantly reacting to what he has to say. But the people in the college and university who are least qualified to do that, who are least capable, really, of getting anything out of it, except the acceptance of authority from the platform to the degree that they can transform it accurately and validly into their notes and into their heads--those are the freshmen and the sophomores. And they're the people who get that kind of instruction per force. You heard Mr. Trujillo this morning talk about his problems as he went to college, and of course we all recognize that his problem was complicated in a myriad of ways by factors that are not shared by most of the undergraduate population. But at bottom, at bottom, the fundamental thing he was talking about basically is the problem of every entering undergraduate. That is to say, he's thrown into a situation in which he receives relatively little guidance and instruction, relatively little tutorial attention, relatively little experienced assistance, and he is expected to sink or swim as best he can until he finally gets to the level at which he can begin to communicate on, if not a one-to-one basis, at least on a small-group basis with those who are the experienced teachers, the experienced researchers, the outstanding authorities in his university. And I think, as I have said, that this is an inversion. I think that it's quite clear to me that by the time people get to the point that they are professionally motivated, professionally oriented, they and their fellows learn much from one another. They've already learned how to direct many of their energies and how to do a great deal. They need the attention far less than the beginners do who are entering into a diffused kind of program without commitment, without the kind of background, without the kind of selective engagement with their fellows and their colleagues that graduate students have. Now all of this, then, I think, leads me to the view that (and this was mentioned again this morning), that the great cry we heard from Berkeley and from other places a few years ago was a complaint against the kind of undergraduate education that seemed to be meaningless. Now I'm not prepared to endorse all of the kinds of things, or most of the kinds of things, perhaps, that are said today by undergraduates with regard to relevancy. But again I think that underlying it all is one basic truth. That is to say that they are herded into institutions where they are dealt with as IBM card numbers, where they have very, very little sense of the meaning and importance of what seems to them to be being conducted in a highly routine fashion without any special reference to what they're getting out of it, or why, and that consequently at that point when they were insisting upon some sort of overall hard look at the process of American higher education, they were saying something that ought to have been heard, and that if it had been heard and if more and some responses had been made to it, if more responses had been made to it, the crisis today, I think, would be much less than it actually is, and the perversions and the distortions of what the essential necessities of relevance are would be less frequent, perhaps, than they now are, and less significant than they now are. So I guess what I'm addressing to you is a kind of plea, and it's a plea that's based upon the assumption that, in fact, graduate faculties do have the predominant number of the really successful people in academic life, of the ablest people in academic life; and that although they did not create the problem, their existence has in many ways contributed to making it, to exascerbating it; and that it seems to me that a degree of initiative taken by what is the most influential segment of the academic community, a degree of initiative to insist upon the reform of the undergraduate program in such a way as to give it coherence and meaning, a degree of commitment that may involve the devotion of a lot of time and energy by people who are now primarily committed to graduate education and research is absolutely essential--not merely if graduate schools are to survive and to flourish (because, as has been suggested, they do require committed and well-trained undergraduates),--but also if the universities are to perform the service to society that they ought to do. May I add as a kind of footnote to that the belief that it is quite true (and this is one of the things about this plea that makes it so important to me, so important to want to address to a group like this), it is quite true that few (and I'm going to say "if any", although I hope there are a few), few undergraduate institutions of any quality can exist at all in this country apart from graduate study. You all know the reasons, you all know the benefits. The thing I'm urging you to do is to encourage your faculties to take some initiative in diminishing the diastrous effects of the failures of the undergraduate college to meet the needs of today's students.

DISCUSSION

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Charles G. Mayo, University of Southern California

Theme: "Urban Problems: The Demand for Graduate-level Action and Special Programs"

address: *REMARKS ON URBAN PROBLEMS: THE DEMAND FOR GRADUATE-LEVEL ACTION AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS*

by: *William May*
Associate Dean
The Graduate School
University of Southern California

Just a couple of words on what I'll be about here. First, although the title is limited to graduate programs or graduate action programs, I'm going to direct my thought here to the university, and the graduate school as part of the university, in the sense that this first thrust here in our panel is intended to give some kind of a theory for support of involvement of the university in action programs. Secondly, this is just part one of four parts, and when we've gathered to talk about how we're going to divide it up, it was agreed that the first one would try to provide the case for and the case against to give us a background, and then the third and fourth speakers will say some things about particular kinds of programs and possible models. In building a case for, there are obviously many kinds of things that have been said about the involvement of the university in urban crisis, or in the midst of urban change, or however it may be framed. I would like to limit my comment to the following things: I'd like to talk a little bit about the role of the institution of education as an anthropologist would see it; a short comment on the neutrality supposed of the university as an educational institution; and then a couple of reasons why it is imperative for the university to be involved. First, I think we must make the point--the obvious point--that neutrality is a myth. We oftentimes hear from people in the universities that we must maintain as scholars our objectivity, our distance from involvement, that we must not be tied to any particular political position or any particular group. I will begin with the statement that neutrality is a myth and pick this up from the standpoint of anthropology. If we're to look at our society from the eyes of a social anthropologist, we would see, and I'm sure we're all familiar with the idea that all institutions in society--all our basic institutions--are geared primarily to preserve, protect, and perpetuate our basic mores, standards, norms, patterns, and so forth. If we look at politics, at law, at economics, at the family, at religion, at education, all of these institutions are geared to preserve, protect, and perpetuate the existing patterns. Perhaps art is the only major institution that acts as some kind of an outlet for expression that might allow dissent or critique. The point here is that there is no such thing as non-involvement on the part of any major institution in our society. All institutions are involved. The choice is not whether to be involved or not, the choice is how the particular institution is going to be involved. I'll give you a case that illustrates what I'm suggesting here. A couple of us at USC submitted successfully last year a grant proposal to the Title One higher education people and received a small grant to work on community school relations in Los Angeles. We were going to try and build models for continuing discussion among competing groups within the Los Angeles community: white, black, brown and the school's community, and we wanted to see if we could do this in some way that would not be responding to crisis only, as has been the pattern in our community when a school blows up then everybody gets moving. And we wanted to see if we could establish a pattern that would work on a continuing basis and perhaps allow some other kind of change. We got the grant and in clearing with one of the important deans on our campus what we were about to do, one involved in education, his response was one of caution. "Do not become political; be careful that you're not taken over by special interest groups; be careful that you don't become spokesmen for particular ghetto groups. And then in the next breath, he said we do not want to upset the political relations that we have worked out so carefully over the years. And then he named the people that we were related to and whom we must not offend. He was simply saying, and he said it very bluntly, do not get on the wrong side. It was clear that our university is very much involved in political relations. There is no such thing as being non-involved. The second thing that I wanted to direct a thought to was that of neutrality, which is related to this first point. Any analysis of the rule of institutions in social conflict or analysis of social conflict reveals that there is in fact no such thing as neutrality in the midst of conflict. In conflict situations such as the struggle of labor for bargaining rights in our recent past, or that of civil rights, or going back to Abolitionism, or today in midst of student unrest, it must be said that individuals and especially institutions are either for or against supposed neutrality which always means a choice to support the status quo. Supposed neutrality, supposedly remaining silent, always means agreeing with and giving some kind of support to the existing patterns and to those who would support the existing pattern. A very good illustration of this is the way in which our religious bodies operated in the south during the civil rights period--which is now past we are told. In the civil rights struggle, the Church in the south tried to maintain what it called the role of reconciler, that of mediator, and consistently argued for non-violence and not upsetting existing patterns in order not to stand in the way of the progress which was being made in not rapid pace but sufficient pace, and steadily. But by being reconcilers and by arguing that there ought not be any conflict they managed in every case to try and squelch any attempt at change, and to, in fact, stand on the side of those who would have supported the existing patterns. This has been documented in many different places and it is a very good example of the kinds of ways in which we see institutions operating when they argue that they are neutral. Alright, I wanted to begin then by saying something about institutions as preservers, protectors and perpetuators and then just this word on neutrality. Now moving from that, I think there are two major reasons--two major things--that are happening that argue for, philosophically for, the involvement of the university in change situations in urban settings especially. The Kerner report focused the critical issue for our society in our urban areas. Racism by the many often unwitting, often unintended, unknowing--but racism, nevertheless--in which most of us participate through the advantages we receive and advantages that we receive without any kind of struggle or attempt to change the way in which we are the recipients. In a recent issue of the New York Review of Books, Anne Woodward rehearses by revealing six or seven books, the history of racism in the United States, and it indicates some of the institutionalizing that began way back in the early 1800's and the way in which this carried on all the way through the Civil War period and then on into this century even in those states in the midwest and in the north that were considered to be anit-slavery and pro desegregation. Anyone who has done any study or done any teaching in the area of minority group conflict is well aware of the way in which patterns of racism have been structured into our normative patterns. Our folkways, our received traditions, support the kind of institutionalized racism of which perhaps some of us have only recently become aware. This summer, CBS series highlighted this in a very interesting way. Perhaps you remember the one where they were reviewing some of the old movies, and Shirley Temple, little Shirley Temple, condescendingly, paternally, having the adult blacks on the head as they danced about her in their obviously fun-loving way ignorant of anything else and yet this is the kind of picture to which we raised no protest in the late 30's and 40's into the 50's. We all saw these things and we supported them. The point here is that we do indeed have a pattern of racism that threatens to do us in and the pattern must be broken, and, if it is to be broken, some central institution for all will have to take the lead in changing the social structure. The change must come from the heart, not at the fringes of society. Refusal to take such lead on the part of the university or any other institution means, again, support for the status quo. Racism infects everything in the urban setting from public schools to mass transit plans to model cities and zoning laws, to police practices and employment patterns. And our universities are generally involved in grants, working in all of these areas, either through grants or through consultantships, through various parts of the university. Certainly in our case and other institutions that I know of in urban settings we are working in almost all of these areas and very often only serving those who are perpetuating whether wittingly or unwittingly the existing pattern. There is again no such thing as neutrality and there is no fact of neutrality if we look at the involvement now of our universities in the midst of urban settings. The second thing that I would point to in addition to rasicm is the changing role or place of the university in our society. And here without going into a long lecture on this I would just point to the fact that it has been well documented, and I think that most of us would be well aware and accept that our society, our culture, has lost that symbolic system which served for a very long time as the center of meaning, as the point or the frame of reference, within which we oftentimes structured our controls and our releases, our interdicts and our remissions, and those of you who have read the man that I am quoting will be aware of this language. It's quite clear though that our traditional symbolic pattern, our traditional meaning system, both in terms of our traditional metaphysic and in terms of society patterns are obviously in disarray. We need only look about us at any newspaper any day to see that. And if the students don't do us in so that Ronald Reagan and Eric Hoffer triumph there is increasing evidence that the university is going to emerge, and is emerging into a role of cultural leadership which was held earlier by the Church. Every culture has a locus of moral leadership or a locus of symbolic meaning or an institution that posits, that serves to posit, the symbolic meaning, and our new center may very well be the university because of certain changes that are occurring which have focused more attention there and the kind especially when we look at things that are happening in terms of our scientific approach to certain kinds of problems and the way in which we turn more to certain kinds of understanding and analysis of problems. A pose of neutrality will not serve the heightened role that the university is being called upon to play and may come to play in a very important fashion. Now, I would just throw in a couple of other less significant factors in the argument for involvement. Obviously, resources are located in the universities for some problems. In our own case, we have a Watts Health Center, we have a Western Center for Law on Poverty that is bringing desegregation suits in many of our white areas, we have grant involvements, we obviously have the resources in terms of people, in terms of interest, and here the community is turning to the university. A second thing under less significant factors is that students are demanding it. Now obviously that may turn out to be a first tactical concern. In terms of philosophical argument, it's something that is not as central. And then, a final factor which cannot be overlooked depending on where one is located--ghetto communities are demanding it and it may be necessary for the survival of our universities. Certainly, in the case of my own university, this tends to be the case. Very simple, then, I'm saying there is no such thing as non-involvement, that urban problems are tied to racism in most instances and that it will require some kind of change brought about at the very heart of our culture lead by a major institution not at the fringes, and that the university is emerging as a politor of new symbols--and I would just say that the graduate school referring to our particular discussion here, the graduate school as part of the university, must be involved in as many ways as possible in taking the leadership role which is necessary for the university.

address: *THE CASE AGAINST URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS*

by: *Emil Lucki, Dean*
Graduate School
San Fernando Valley State College

This is the second time in the last decade that graduate schools have been called to action programs. The first call came when Sputnik triggered the nation to make the giant leap in space science and technology, and the nation harnessed the graduate schools into a concerted drive in science. The second, actuated by recent social convulsions and primed by the federal War on Poverty, calls for serious urban action to relieve the pressures in our cities. Since both actions are intended to be for the good of the nation and are highly popular, even among academicians, if the number of articles on the subject in our journals are any indication, it would seem to be foolhardy for one to take a stand against them. But I am willing to court disfavor and to act as the devil's advocate, at least in regard to the second drive.

But before I present my case against urban action programs, let me first point out that the graduate schools have been engaged in urban action programs for a long time, though nobody called them urban action programs; and let me cite just four examples, two from U.C.L.A. and two from my own school.

In its rationale of the program of its School of Social Work, U.C.L.A. states that the purpose of the program is to train personnel how to research social problems, how to devise solutions to these problems, and how to implement these solutions, or, to put it in today's popular language, how to relate these programs to contemporary social needs. Obviously, this is an urban action program, even if it has not been so called.

The second example is the Institute of Industrial Relations. From its description we note that the two activities of the Institute are (1) to study labor-management relations, wages and related problems, economic security programs, labor market, impact of technological changes, problems of poverty and minority groups, human relations, labor law and labor history, and (2) servicing, through these programs, the needs of management, unions, public and other groups interested in industrial relations. Again, it requires no stretch of imagination to see this program as an urban action program intended to help resolve the ever pressing socioeconomic problem of labor in our industrial and business systems.

The two examples from my college are (1) the preparation of teacher-administrators for the management of Institutions of the Dean and the "retooling" of teachers teaching in disadvantaged areas to make them more responsive to the attitudes of school children in these areas. Both programs were prompted by pressing social needs in our urban centers; and both, obviously, are urban social action programs.

I am sure comparable programs are being offered by most other schools and that the total of these programs is impressive. Moreover, in each case the only reason for their existence is their social service function. And yet the popular chant today is that graduate schools do not relate and that "they better do something about it" and "do it in a hurry"; and this provides me with my first argument against urban action programs, as these programs are conceived by today's crusaders for urban action, namely, the nature and intent of these programs.

If what is being done is not enough, then, obviously, more is expected; and if what is being done is not relevant, then the nature of what is being done must be changed. And both changes, if carried too far, pose a danger to graduate study.

To devote more resources and energies to these programs is to curtail the resources and energies for the pursuit of basic research, for the search of pure knowledge, the basis for all applied knowledge--and all urban action programs are the application of fundamental knowledge--and this would have disastrous consequences for graduate education in the long run. And if what is now done is not relevant, then, clearly, relevance must mean either seeing things from the opposite point of view, or extending the objective of the program beyond the normal limits, that is, extending it beyond the diagnosis of society's problems, beyond the search for solutions, beyond the training of personnel to perform these functions, to the actual involvement, even as members of graduate staffs, in the implementation of the proposed solutions. And if, indeed, this is what relevance has come to mean, then are our graduate seminars in social sciences to be recast to become sensitivity sessions rather than scientific investigations of society? And are our graduate staffs and students in social sciences and in education to become "sensitized" social engineers forcing the reconstruction of society in accordance with their own "sensitized" blueprints?

This, in my opinion, is the greatest danger to our graduate schools, namely, that under the steady pressure of federal government, made less objectionable by extensive largess in the form of grants for the reform of education, and under mounting persuasion of well-meaning social reformers, of mass protesters, and of our own humanitarian impluses, we in the graduate school become a social action agency of or for the government for the reconstruction of society. For once the graduate schools become this, their role to serve society as the guardians of free inquiry and as bulwarks against dictation from the government, from the majority, or the minority is over. Clearly, this can be a disaster of the first order of magnitude.

If this danger is still some distance away, there is, nevertheless, a related danger that is already upon us. In our rapidly polarizing society, we have great difficulty in escaping involvement. We take one side or the other, but irrespective of the side we join we lose freedom of action. If we join the cause of the minorities, we yield to the leadership of the minority, for they dictate the curriculum as well as the recruitment of staff and students. At the same time as supporters of the clamorous minority, we draw the ire of the majority which sees us as social agitators and so wants to take over control of curriculum, the very basis of our freedom to be true professors. On the other hand, if we take the side of the Establishment, sooner or later, in self defense from harassment and provocation by the opposite side, we have to be its spokesmen and so jeopardize our role as independent scholars also. The gravity of this situation is serious enough to require us to weigh carefully the consequences of converting our graduate schools into social action institutions.

Another argument stems from the fact that current urban action programs, if not in themselves, then in their nature, purpose, and urgency, are, at least, in part politically inspired and so are partisan in their derivation. For the graduate schools to embrace these indiscriminately and to engage in their implementation is to choose sides in politics--incidentally, at the very same time that we loudly protest political interference in our affairs--and to endanger our budgets and our freedoms. And if you doubt my word, I urge you to mingle with the white collar workers in their service and professional clubs; and you will hear this constant refrain, "I used to support higher education but not a damn cent from now on" or "If you don't do something about this mess in your schools, we'll do it for you". Clearly, the price and the risks are too high for us to abandon our appointed role.

Still another argument is the aggravation of the difficulty to work out the proper mix between teaching, research, and social action. It is hard enough to assess the merits of teaching as against the merits of research. As we know, everybody is a "good teacher" whether he engages in research or not, and, especially, if he is low in research and this creates problems in promotion practice. Now if we add the third ingredient, i.e., social activism, we will aggravate the problems, for, invariably, the "good" social action man will also claim to be a "good" teacher and vice versa. How long will it be before the research man, the backbone of the graduate school, will be relegated to a tertiary place as a kind of a necessary technician and rewarded accordingly? And just imagine the number of grievances that will flow to the grievance committees investigation promotion complaints and the friction that all this will create among the faculty! If you say that this is a small price to pay for good social action, I would urge you to find out how much solid work was done by those faculties where the struggle for power between the activists and the traditionalists has absorbed their time and energies for the last year or so. I am sure that you will be shocked by your discovery. Indeed, you may even hear such a statement as I did recently from a promising scholar turned activist when he announced, "I am setting aside my research in order to join the crusade for change in our schools."

Now if there are those who feel that it is their duty to engage in the reconstruction of our society, let me urge them to follow the example of Keynesian economists who, while not practicing deficit budgeting in their own departments, and while not engaging as social action squadrons, by the sheer logic and volume of their scholarly output persuaded the western governments to practice it until western societies were transformed. It is not too much to expect that by similar dedication to scholarly work they might be able to persuade society to accept their reconstruction gospel, and to achieve this without violating their roles as social scientists and without jeopardizing the integrity and the freedom of their graduate schools. We as scholars and the graduate schools as centers of scholarship have had tremendous influence on our society so far and will continue to have no less influence if only we will act out our roles as true scientists and not as self-appointed social reformers.

I could have presented the case in the third person. I could have begun by asking whether there is a case to be built, and then I might have followed with the argument that it could be shown that graduate schools are engaged in serving society's needs, that demands for more service and for greater relevance could endanger pure research, could reduce the researcher to a technician, could threaten freedom of research and autonomy of graduate schools and their role as defenders against dictation from all and everyone, and could create some operational problems and, indeed, difficulties for the schools. But if I had done so, the case may have sounded hypothetical and so remote. It was to avoid just this impression that I prepared the case in the first person. The matter is most urgent and needs to be studied carefully, not with the view of reducing action programs but of determining the right action programs, that is, programs which can serve all society without at the same time undermining the institutions which make this service possible.

address: *INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS TO POSITIVE RESPONSES TO THE DEMAND FOR URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS*

by: *Philip M. Rice*
Dean
Claremont Graduate School

It is difficult to discuss institutional barriers without resorting to clichés about boards of trustees, cumbersome faculty procedures, budgetary limitations, and outmoded university structures. It is equally difficult to approach the problem without becoming entangled in the web of cross-currents and pressures related to programs for minority students.

In a period in which all institutions of higher learning are, or soon will be, under seige from both within and without, the greatest barrier to intelligent action of any kind on almost any issue would seem to be the hopeless confusion that engulfs us and the concomitant lack of intelligent direction. The truth of the matter is, that faced with a major social revolution, most academicians are at a loss to know how to control it, are unable to fathom its depth, and are caught in the dilemma of having to determine whether to lead, to follow, or to ignore. The resulting quandry often leads to frantic answers on the part of one or another segment of the academic community and produces a net effect that is as indecisive as it is unintelligible.

Indecision in itself is not necessarily the principal deterrent to positive action. Concern with traditional academic practices, the ordering of priorities, and adherence to set values and standards are major factors precluding involvement in social action programs. Faculties, administrators, and students are divided on the question of involvement although the tenor of the times and the influence of urban-located universities and colleges has already eroded many of the existing barriers.

Graduate faculties themselves may pose a special problem. According to a recent study (conducted by Ann M. Heiss) of 1600 respondents in 10 major graduate schools, only five per cent expressed a belief in direct social involvement. Fourteen per cent "believed scholars should remain detached from social problems," and eighty-one per cent stated that the scholar's role was to "provide education in intellectual analysis for those who will bring about social improvement . . ."* Perhaps the hard-core battles and emergency deliberations of the first two months in 1969 have made substantial inroads on the convictions of those 1600 professors but the older and more experiences scholars are less likely to react as readily to demands for action programs than are their junior colleagues.

The rapidity with which the demand for urban action programs has grown has highlighted the inherent difficulties facing a positive response. The existing pressure is for programs that are interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and, quite frequently, non-disciplinary. This in itself imposes problems for those universities that have yet to develop flexibility in their academic curricula or to overcome the long delays occasioned by the necessity of going through traditional departmental channels. Structure, even with its arduous and somewhat ponderous system of faculty committees, refferals, study groups, administrative examination, and the added complications of student involvement, is but partly responsible for the inability of the academic community to respond to demands upon it even where there is a will to do so. Administrators, relying on ad hoc and often unpublicized advisory groups drawn from faculty and student segments, should know only too well that bypassing the regular academic process may speed up decisions to the hour of press release but establish a reaction that ultimately results in inertia, chaos, or open warfare.

There is, however, a deeper problem involved than that of academic organization or the attempts to side-step it. The urban action program has today become inextricably bound up with the problem of control and its accompanying reversal of commonly accepted scholarly principles. It is trying enough for the scholar trained in a traditional discipline to accept the challenges of new fields and the rearrangement of existing ones that must be made to meet the demands imposed by urban problems. The transition, however, is neither impossible nor, given time, more than an active mind can encompass. Even the stress on action, which may impose serious problems to the majority of Ann Heiss's 1600 graduate faculty, does not pose an insurmountable barrier. What has made the situation impossible for some, however, is the introduction of elements that are completely foreign to recognized values and the growing awareness that the whole basis of scholarship is on the verge of being drastically upset.

---

*The Chronicle of Higher Education, III (No. 2, February 10, 1969)5.

The urban action program, according to many of its proponents, requires personnel for whom scholarly training in a recognized field is far down on a list of priorities that calls for primarily participants who belong to a particular ethnic minority and who can relate to a corresponding group in the urban community with which the interaction is to take place. This stress on qualifications that are foreign to many members of the graduate community is, in itself, a major barrier to effective action. The downgrading of scholarly achievement and the acceptance of the concept that only blacks can relate to blacks or Chicanos to Chicanos violates the very principles on which much of our present scholarship has been based. Even those who are accustomed to area studies programs in which the purpose has been to provide students with knowledge about a culture other than their own, find it difficult to adapt to demands for programs controlled by the very elements that are to be studied. There is, in short, a growing dichotemy, predicated in part on the introduction of an action element, that is virtually impossible to resolve within the existing university framework.

The independent, autonomous center that now fully occupies the attention of many institutions, has become so involved with the "identity crisis" and power struggle, that its use as a mechanism for fulfilling the demand for action-oriented programs is in danger of being overlooked. Both faculty and administration appear baffled by the problem and seek solutions that are totally unrelated to academic concepts. Meaning has given way to frustration and rational behavior to emotionalism. The struggle itself has crystallized attitudes and raised barriers that may be impossible to surmount unless swept away by the tide of revolution. In a period of acrimony and mistrust, of militant action and armed contention, it seems unlikely that widely divergent views will be brought together through normal institutional channels. It is more likely that, if it remains undestroyed, the structure itself will change to accommodate an approach to urban-related problems that is both more comprehensive and more realistic than any now apparent.

The nature of the structural change that may develop is difficult to pin-point. It is quite possible that the challenge can be met by the creation of new groupings involving all, or at least a majority, of the academic institutions and the service centers within a given urban area. Such a reordering would undoubtedly necessitate the restructuring of individual universities and colleges and occasion a major change in academic organization and educational goals. A second possibility, already much discussed, would be the establishment of federal, urban grant universities deriving both students and faculty from groups now involved in making demands for autonomous centers, and directing their programs toward solutions of urban problems.

Solutions, whether for good or ill, are not the purpose of this paper. Certainly neither of the aforementioned possibilities could be accomplished in such short order as to answer immediate demands or relieve imminent pressures. Institutions, for the present at least, must deal with what they have. Solutions are apt to be pragmatic rather than based on principle and to be political rather than academic. Aware of their own organizational disabilities, many institutions will continue to by-pass normal academic procedures or else faculty will surrender their traditional prerogatives for the sake of immediate action. At the moment, most institutions remain at least one step behind. The time and energies of their faculties, student bodies, administrations, and boards are taken up presenting and meeting demands rather than solving basic problems with sound deliberation. Lack of leadership is often excused on the grounds that universities have always responded to pressure, the major difference now being the rapidity with which demands for action are currently made.

Perhaps this last is the greatest barrier of all. Perhaps the academic environment flourishes only when allowed to develop at a more leisurely pace than is now allowed. It may be that the university itself is so constructed that it must rely on the concept that intelligent men can resolve differences through the exchange of ideas, without prejudice, without dogma, without violence.

address: *MODELS OF RESPONSE TO DEMANDS FOR URBAN ACTION PROGRAMS*

by: *Lawson Crowe*
Acting Dean, Graduate School
University of Colorado

In the summer of 1968 I attended a conference on the theme, "The University: Agency of Social Change?" As you might expect, there were those who argued that it was, and there were those who said it wasn't. There were a number of participants who argued eloquently that the university should not participate directly in the process of social change. These people upheld the ideal of the university as a community which, if not exactly ivory towered, was the place where the deliberate, objective search for knowledge ruled out desirability of the university performing direct services to governments, businesses and other institutions.

In the innocence of my heart, I accepted this latter view. Looking backward, that debate seems pointless. We are more than a little bit pregnant. I was beguiled by what Galbraith has called the "conventional wisdom" in respect to the university. I was simply ignorant of the extent to which units of and individuals within American universities are already engaged in direct efforts to change our society.

Moreover, a moment's reflection suggests that there is nothing new or startling about the universities' engagement in the process of change. The major business of the university, the education of the young, has had demonstrable effects on society and is likely to continue to contribute to change. American universities have participated for many years in social change through their roles as consultants to government, business, and public educators, and in many cases universities have provided directly for technical innovations. The role of the land-grant university in the development of modern agriculture and the role of our medical schools in the development of public health services are two obvious examples. How many mechanical cherry pickers and other devices, how many improvements in agricultural practices, were in direct response to explicit needs I will not try to say. It is clear, however, that universities have responded to the demand for immediate solutions to problems for many years with varying measures of success.

A troubling element in the current demand for solutions to immediate problems is that universities are now being asked to develop a technology comparable to the technology which revolutionized agriculture. Quite apart from the fact that any new technology is liable to be unsettling, if not altogether revolutionary, social technology is still an area of substantial uncertainty. Considering the number of variables that influence the life of urban man, it is not surprising that the problems we are now attempting to solve are poorly understood. In addition, we are not in a very good position to answer the questions, whose technology? and for what? These were not difficult questions for the farmer who needed better milk production or a mechanical cherry picker.

The unsettled state of university relations with the various agencies of society is reflected, at least in part, in the variety of programs organized by universities to ameliorate urban problems. A brief survey of my own university revealed that various departments, institutes and individuals were engaged in the following kinds of direct action programs:

(1) participating with government agencies in the planning of low cost housing, anti-pollution systems, model sewage systems, model school systems, producing various kinds of engineering models, etc.;

(2) conducting training programs for social workers in the inner city, for workers in urban government agencies;

(3) conducting in-service training programs for presently employed teachers, employment counselors, city administrators;

(4) providing regular contractual services to some government agencies, e.g., school testing programs, court work, research for model cities' committees;

(5) providing evaluation research of an action program conducted by a government agency;

(6) conducting a VISTA training center for VISTA volunteers;

(7) offering social work services, health, education, etc. to migrant workers;

(8) teaching without compensation in a ghetto area-free night college organized by faculty.

Some graduate students are involved in virtually all these activities and to the extent which these do participate their education is probably more action-oriented than ever before.

I wish I could say that a significant portion of these programs concentrate as heavily on basic research as they do on solutions to immediate problems. Unfortunately, this is not the case. For example, the Center for Action-Research in the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado undertook a training program for civil servants in the Department of Labor by offering a three-week Employment Security Institute on the Management and Operation of Youth Opportunity Programs. With the development of the War on Poverty the counselling and placement service of Departments of Employment expanded. Youth Opportunity Centers were established to assist unemployed youths between the ages of 17 and 22 who were not in school. In our region of the country this meant working with large numbers of Spanish Americans. Typically the civil servant who offers counselling and job placement is white and middle class. The problem was to prepare the civil servant to perform his job better, to provide sensitivity training to job counselors whose clientele come primarily from an unfamiliar culture and residential background.

The Institute was actually initiated by the special services supervisor of the Colorado Department of Employment who suggested that the university propose this special training program. Members of the Center for Action-Research agreed to organize the program and proposed that the Institute be conducted in a poverty area of Denver, that it employ disadvantaged youth who would be able to present their views and experiences directly to the job counselors, and that it be supplemented by field trips in which the job counselors themselves would play the roles of disadvantaged youth. At the time, 1964, the Poverty program was getting underway, the format was novel, and the Department of Labor provided the necessary funds. For three weeks, job counselors lived among the poor of Denver, talked with them and tried to learn what it was like to search for work under conditions imposed by poverty and lack of education.

Was the Institute a success? Orthodox methods of evaluation calling for carefully selected control groups, matched for important characteristics and studied for differential responses under controlled conditions were clearly not available in this project. The best the

Center for Action-Research could do was to compare the participants with themselves and to try to identify areas of expected attitude and opinion change as a result of participation in the Institute. Questionnaires asking for subjective evaluation of the Institute by the participants and evaluation of a daily log kept by each participant suggested that most of them did profit from the experience. Here one is tempted to remark that the Behavioral Sciences here once again verified that great principle that one way to find out about the attitudes, views, and opinions of people is to talk to them.

In addition to such programs, the Center for Action-Research conducts a continuing training center for the VISTA program, and offers social services to migrant workers in Colorado through the Colorado Migrant Workers Council. Participation of graduate students in these programs is in large part "field training" and action-oriented. The emphasis is necessarily upon solving immediate problems and secondarily upon the discovery of new techniques and principles.

The Bureau of Community Services of the University of Colorado is another example of response to the demand for urban action programs. In contrast to the Center for Action-Research, the Bureau of Community Services emphasizes educational programs designed to assist communities in the development of community leadership. It attempts to provide educational programs which will help local citizens deal with the problems of community improvement. The Bureau's primary emphasis is on informal education, assistance to communities in developing action programs, and program planning relative to altering or changing trends or characteristics of a given community (exquisitely naive). To carry out these tasks the Bureau is staffed by a director and four so-called community consultants.

Although the Bureau of Community Services literature emphasizes the basic social science research which underlies its programs, an examination of its current activities suggests that the major emphasis is on meeting specific requests for service from local communities and local government agencies. The Bureau has, for example, assisted in the development of resident participation in the Denver Model Cities program. It has assisted in the launching of low cost housing construction in Mesa County, has organized a man power study for Adams County, has sponsored a program aimed at informing Denver residents about the issue of public school integration and has sponsored a program designed to inform suburban residents about urban problems. There is little or no graduate training associated with the Bureau except on a purely incidental basis.

In direct response to the felt need in both the urban community and the university for improved two way communication, the University of Colorado organized a Center for Urban Affairs, the purpose of the Center is to improve education, research, and service with respect to the resolution of vital urban problems. The Center focusses its interest primarily on Denver and other metropolitan areas in Colorado.

The Center for Urban Affairs is conventional in its academic organization. Its staff is interdisciplinary, composed of economists, architects, psychologists, and civil engineers who are members of the faculty. In addition, it has a professional support staff of twelve people. The Center has already offered a multidiscipline course for both upper division and graduate students in Urban Affairs, and proposes to establish a master's degree program in Urban Affairs, Urban Planning, and Urban Design, which will be administered by the interdisciplinary executive committee of the Center in cooperation with other units of the university.

Although the Center has been in existence for only a year, it has attracted nearly $200,000 of sponsored research and training proposals from the City and County of Denver, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Members of the Center and the professional staff have completed a study of New Community Development Criteria for Colorado new towns. The Center is conducting a New Careers Training Program which will train and place 120 local persons in new service careers in the fields of health, education, and welfare and corrections. The Center is also co-sponsoring the National Seminar on Urban Transportation for Tomorrow in the spring of 1969 with the Public Service Company of Colorado, and is engaged in many other local activities.

Graduate student participation in this developing program has been limited so far but it is clear that this will change if plans for master's programs are implemented.

In addition to the three examples given here there are at least six other major groups at the University of Colorado engaged in research or service or training relative to urban affairs. There are also the numerous courses in sociology, political science, public administration, economics, engineering, public health, nursing, genetics, social psychology, biochemistry, biology, etc., etc., which have direct or indirect bearing on the problems associated with modern urban life. Seen from one perspective the university is ideally equipped with manpower and knowledge to attack the problems and produce solutions. But from the inside the university appears to be a bewildering conglomerate of agencies, interests, and purposes. In a recent speech the Director of the Bureau of Community Services said that we are trapped into dealing with social change "piece-meal" and sometimes the university itself is apparently fighting a rear-guard battle for obsolete modes of thought and action.

Since problems of urban life will not wait for solution, American universities will probably be required to resolve them. Funds for mission-oriented research are available. In our haste to meet the immediate needs, however, we may be tempted to neglect basic research into the forces that shape and control the life of this society.

DISCUSSION

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Ralph W. Gererd, University of California, Irvine

Theme: "The Professionalization of Graduate Education"

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

by: *Ralph W. Gererd*
Dean, Graduate Division
University of California, Irvine

I am not going to presume to introduce to you two of the best known members of this organization and two of the most active men in graduate affairs in this country. I will say this much about their presence here, though, informing this panel my first and rather abortive thought was to have a graduate dean whose background qualified him to speak from the point of view of one or another of the professions, and Joe certainly can speak for engineering, Wes for education, and I did try to get a third one to speak for the health sciences but we lost out on that and since I am an M.D. and a lot of other things in that area, I undertook to play that role. And the minute we began thinking about this collectively, we decided this was not the way to break down the subject. We would rather consider the broader aspects than the particular professions and so we are left with no excuse for this particular panel except that some of them are darned good. I don't think I need say anything more at this stage. I'll get back into the picture a little later. We agreed we would not have prepared manuscripts. We agreed we would limit our opening remarks to an extremely few minutes, hopefully, not more than five; we will then allow interaction with the panel for a brief time, perhaps another fifteen minutes and all the remainder of the time we hope to be a committee of the whole, batting these things around with the audience and the panel interacting freely. The only further decision that we made operationally was that Joe McCarthy would be our lead-off man, sort of sound the motif, or at least a major motif. Not only is the motif that we have chosen one that is dear to his heart, but he is a very effective deep instrument player, and I think both of us felt we would rather come later and shoot at him than have him come later and shoot at us. Joe, you have the floor.

OPENING REMARKS

by: *Joseph L. McCarthy*
Dean, Graduate School
University of Washington

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my first quandry is what is meant by the professionalization of graduate education. And, in recent years, as I think some of you know, I have come around the track pretty far in this respect and I'd like now to give you what my interpretation is of this question and, let's say, its relevance. I couldn't really help as I listened to the prior discussion on the urban relationships of coming to the conclusion that that's really what we're talking about here as we will shortly see, I think. Now I have really five propositions that I'd like to make and then retire, Mr. Chairman.

(Chairman: Momentarily.)

The first proposition, as far as I'm concerned, it seems to me that all advanced study is professional. Now this gets down to what you mean by the words, and I think that the meanings of words do change. But my first proposition is that in our university and college roles we should accept the idea that really all of advanced study is essentially professional. It's practiced by professors, it's led by professors, it's designed to introduce people into roles that inevitably are professional roles. And I think we just ought to face it and I will interpret that word to mean all of advanced study.

The second proposition is that we ought to identify, at least as limiting situations, two quite different objectives of advanced study, and one of these is the objective of training persons for research and/or creative scholarship, for advancing knowledge. And the second role, the second objective, seems to me to be quite different, is to train people for the practice of a profession, for professional practice. And it seems to me these are clearly different, and yet our structure it seems to me today doesn't really ultimately accommodate this set of ideas. It seems to me that we must move ahead vigorously to try to talk this out and agree, if we can, on the policy that there does exist within the conventional graduate study, graduate school organizational pattern these two quite different kinds of programs. So my second thesis is that we should identify these two objectives and we should arrange to distinguish the type of experience that is appropriate for each of these two tracks. And we should identify an appropriate name system. Now, as far as I'm concerned, the two limiting cases are the M.D. and the Ph.D., Doctor, with the M.D. being an advanced study program clearly designed for professional practice. And the Ph.D. at least traditionally and even now is clearly agreed upon as oriented toward preparation of persons for research and advanced teaching, which I think are inseparable. But we must do much more.

The third thesis I have is that we ought to encourage, as a matter of policy within graduate programs, the development of more, perhaps many more, practice-oriented programs. Now let me give you just two or three cases to suggest what I mean by that. In the sense of the master and the doctor's degree, either one, what I say I think is still appropriate. But we've seen in the last decade or two for example, relative to the last topic discussed just before our break, the evolution from sociology into social work. We've seen out of political science has come public administration and so on. And surely public administration and the social work fields are clearly practitioner fields. We've seen out of the department of economics come the MBA programs, that are now pretty widely done. And it seems to me perfectly clear that what we're really looking for in the academic sense, in relation to, for example, the problems of the city, are practitioners of the social sciences and we're not getting them. So I propose that we encourage the evolution of practice-oriented programs in our colleges and universities.

Fourthly, I think, my prejudices show pretty directly, that the time is at hand when we ought to identify a teaching oriented, by this I mean college teaching oriented doctoral degree, and at our institution we are pretty far along in conversations on the doctor of arts either in or for teachers. And it seems to me that the time is long overdue to move into this realm so that we have a clear pattern there of a place for professional practice. Now let me just add a couple of more sentences about this. As I think many of you know, the mathematicians debated the doctor of mathematics at great length, and finally decided not to do it. If one does accept the idea of a practice-oriented teaching advanced study program, such as the doctor of arts proposed by, I guess Bowen, at the University of Virginia originally and it's been discussed a good deal since, then there's the single way to identify a program of preparation for college teaching, the practice of college teaching (now I'm not talking about research), and it seems to me that we should move in this direction as a matter of primary policy.

And, finally, this is my fifth thesis, that we do not really, it seems to me, have the proper internal academic organizational structure in order to do what I'm proposing very effectively. We do not have, I think, in many of our institutions, any clarity of purpose with respect to the graduate programs on one hand and the professional programs on the other in the traditional way of speaking about this. And law and medicine and dentistry then and now many others can be thought of as being professional and we must somehow get the graduate school, or the graduate advanced studies school somehow oriented to accommodate the overall college or university needs, whether they be research oriented or practice oriented.

Now, in conclusion, I think that the benefits that would be derived by clarifying our objectives such as in the fashion I've described or, if you don't like this fashion, some other way, the benefits would be very great. The student would get a better deal in the sense of what he came for. The student would benefit substantially if we were to clarify our objectives and get our programs oriented more specifically toward those objectives. And, secondly, and finally, society would surely benefit, too. This is a day when the costs have mounted and there are real questions being asked from every side as to the costs of education, especially graduate education, too. And if we could do more to orient in a broader sense, more specifically, our graduate programs in the two ways I've mentioned, I'm sure that this would be a major social advance.

OPENING REMARKS

by: *Wesley P. Lloyd*
Dean, Graduate School
Brigham Young University

I would like to just call attention to some of the things we've been looking at this morning and this afternoon. And I've been thinking how grateful I am to that group of pioneer graduate deans, and some of them are here today, who created this Association so that we could get together as graduate deans in a small group as we are today, listen to the kind of things that we've listened to and discussed, and even in Las Vegas we can keep on going without the glitter taking our group away.

Now, when it comes to this matter of professionalism in graduate education, we could take, I think, as graduate deans, at least two major factors that we'd have to consider. One is the professionalism that exists within our own offices as graduate deans. You've noted, for instance, that from the papers we've heard today, there's no doubt about the professional stature or the scholastic quality of graduate deans. I raise mostly the quality about our administrative ability. Nobody has to suffer but our students. I don't mean our students in our classes. I'm talking about what happens in many institutions because of perhaps not fully professional administrative operations. So I raise that as one of the things that we as graduate deans have to look at pretty carefully. And then there's this significant thing that Joe has been saying about the practice-oriented or research-oriented professionalism. And this we certainly would have no quarrel with. In this other minute I have or whatever it takes, I would like to suggest, however, that there's one area of the practice-oriented that seems to have to be beyond, or in a little different category, than what we'd usually talk about as the practice-oriented, and that is the preparation of college teachers. It's rather popular now, and becoming more and more popular, for us to say that we'd better develop this professional group of college teachers and as desperately as they're needed I can see why we want to make some shortcuts. We want to in most of our cases develop that not on the Ph.D. route, because we say that is traditionally the research oriented. But somehow when we're talking about having teachers move over into the level of merely being reflectors. Now I grant you that if the teacher doesn't take a Ph.D. that doesn't mean that he has to be a reflector. I grant you that there's plenty of room for the idea that a good researcher can also be an excellent teacher. And he can be professional both ways. I grant also that we can have some people that can be one and certainly not the other. But the question perhaps that we have to ask ourselves as an organization now, not so much as individuals, as a professional organization in what direction are we going to ask these people in these programs to point. If we take, for instance, the college teacher who's preparing, and say he doesn't have to be much concerned with these rugged disciplines of research, are we encouraging a pattern of college teachers who will not be in the creative and the investigative and analytical mold? Now there can be many approaches to this problem, but certainly some of us are feeling a little more and more that we'd better not give up the Ph.D. route to teaching until we know that this factor of research and creativity will not be sacrificed on the road.

~~DISCUSSION~~ OPENING REMARKS

GERARD

I'm tempted to go back and tie in this question of professionalism and scholarliness in the graduate school, with the broader question again of the goals of the university, because not only is it to be legitimately questioned whether all the good things that have to be done for young people must be done at a university, but whether those things the university accepts as its duty to do should be layered at appropriate levels, run concurrently, whether they should be sharply defined by boundaries of the series of degree hurdles, or whether each individual should be encouraged to run his own track in time and content and direction which is possible with the newer technologies as they come into use, the organizational as well as the electronic technologies. So, when in higher education, from the time the student enters college and finishes his last postdoctoral year and goes off to do something in industry or government, or academia, when do these various things happen to him ideally? I would maintain the unique role of the university is in relation to the rational aspects of man which are educable. Now one who thinks and has no emotion is a pretty sorry individual. And in spite of what Wes said, the fact that we are here thinking instead of lolling around emoting in this splendid emotive area may be an indictment of graduate deans and graduate education. But I do submit that, whereas the reason can be trained, if I may use that word, the skills of using it can be enhanced and the material on which to use it can certainly be imparted, this is not true essentially for the emotions. One can help educate someone so that things which did not previously have any emotional impact do, as in understanding art and music and other fine creative things, or literature, or science itself, but one can't teach somebody how to love or hate or anything else. And furthermore, none of these things are cumulative overtime.

This is a very important difference. So when we are told that the ivory tower view of the university is passe, we must get out in the world and be part of it in feeling and in action, I say the university has nothing to contribute educationally in the matter of feeling and as far as action is concerned it has been made abundantly clear from the preceding session somewhat earlier what the university I think, can contribute is a rational basis on which to decide the kind of action one wants to indulge in, and whether one does that after graduating as part of his service to man, whether one does it as an individual colaterally with his activity in the university, it is not part of the function of the university as a university. There have been times when universities forgot that. One of them was when the universities became subservient to a very strong social influence, and in that case it happened to be the dogmatic church and we went through the centuries of the Dark Ages. And when the universities eschewed their responsibility for reason, so did all civilization. And another not very pleasant and much more recent and happily shorter episode of that kind was in Germany when Hitler proclaimed, "We think with our blood." When you think with your blood, ladies and gentlemen, that's likely to be an outcome. Well, I couldn't resist that. If youth needs psychotherapy in order to find its orientation and become disalienated, that is a very important service. But I do not think it's a function of the university. It should be done beforehand, or maybe the kids can go to Essel on weekends, or do something of that sort? This is not a proper university function, in my judgment. Well, I spoke of the time sequence; the college ought, I think, to be the general opportunity to build the background of culture beyond the three R's, so to speak, should be the place where one learns some of the skills of examining and manipulating ideas, communicating, being aware, being sensitive to experiences, and so on.

On the graduate level, I would like to think, one begins to develop sufficient mastery of some corner of this whole area so that one can begin to actively participate in it, and not largely, passively be led along, and even in an active undergraduate discussion group it is still being lead by the master to learn how to discuss rather than to contribute significant discussion. At the graduate level that should no longer be true, but should be active participation in a real sense and creativity beginning to emerge in a wide sense. Maybe at the postdoctoral level, whether it be in a medical school or in a postdoctoral research year in a laboratory, or as a fellow to go off to a museum and write a book, or fieldwork somewhere. One becomes really professionally qualified, not merely to participate actively, but to participate at a level of competence that enables you to deliver your services of whatever kind they be. Now that may be a little different from what Joe was saying, but I don't think we're in any serious disagreement. I mentioned the unfortunate aspects of the lockstep and won't go into it again. Last year I had a chance to speak to you about professional education and that was the gist of my thesis that with the newer technologies, we should be able to break this, stop batch processing students and treat them in an online interactive manner. I can't resist, however, saying again if I've said it before that the notion that so many people have of the depersonalization of education by the newer technologies, the IBM card thing with computerated instruction is exactly wrong. This is the one opportunity one has except for the private tutor, a Socrates and Alexander, so to speak, to really give the individual student an opportunity to develop himself with individual tutorial guidance. One could speak of basic science, applied science, professionalism and some of the examples that Joe used would fit into those three gategories.

Psychology would be a basal science, maybe political psychology or social work would be an applied, and education would be profession. Now there's a little looseness there. Physics, the basic science, the application of physics in industry would be an applied science and straight engineering would be the professional. And one last word there about teaching. I would think that since teaching implies the ability to know more about what it all is than the students to whom you are teaching it, that rather than the teaching line being somewhat second class it should be somewhat superior. I do not maintain, as many of my colleagues do, that you cannot be a good teacher without being a creative investigator. But I do maintain you can't be a good teacher without being a fellow master of your subject and that means more than knowing a lot of quiz-kid answers. It means understanding it in its entirety and if you do that, you're likely to do some research whether you publish articles in the professional journals or not.

This is rather interesting in the professions. As an example, the men who are brought in to be professors of medicine or professors of engineering or professors of law are not the people who can't be good doctors or engineers or lawyers. They are the very good ones, and they are chosen and respected highly by their colleagues out in practice because it is assumed that they know their subject, and they know it very well and have some other skills as well.

Discussion

LLOYD

May I question you a little further on your definition of a university? There was a time when most of us knew what a university was, but the more we looked at our universities in our own country, the more we saw universities in other countries, the less we were inclined to give an absolute definition of a university. For instance, as long as I'm in the United States, I'm ready to pray that the community will step in and change the university material and wake it up.

GERARD

I'll even add that to this country. I think maybe what we are saying is not what it should be doing, but how well it's doing it. Oh yes, I'll go with you on that one.

MCCARTHY

I'd like to take off on a little different track. You know, if one looks back to the Flexner report, 1912 or so, isn't it true that prior to that time the traditional way to teach medicine in the United States was really through part-time people, that is, the practitioners came in from their practice and served as the professors of medicine, and this was one of the main recommendations of the Flexner report, wasn't it, to engage full-time faculty. Now, that is 1910. Let me say the following, that the recruitment of engineering faculty until perhaps 20 years ago or so functioned in a quite similar manner. The way that engineering faculty received their training up until a couple of decades ago, was that they practiced engineering and then they were brought back in to function as members of the faculty so that the traditional way of training people in the professions, if you'll let me use that word again, was strictly to have people function in a practitioner's way and then come back and teach. Now the point I really want to make is that we have a problem in relation to the cities, in fact certain immediate social problems that have already been discussed in the prior conversation. And it seems to me that the time is right for us to really move toward generation within the university of certain orderly ways for us to prepare people for practice of certain social professions which are not now really even very clearly defined. I think the social work one is now farthest along.

GERARD

I utterly agree with you and forgive me if I give you a rather long comment on that. I think it is historically demonstrative that most of the subject areas of our present university departments originated by the attempt of people to solve practical problems. Botany arose early because people were looking for medicines in herbs, so you had to know something about the different plants. Geometry, its very name says, people were interested in knowing how to measure the earth so that after the floods of the Nile wiped out all the barriers, people could find out a way to re-identify their particular farm in the valley region. Astronomy came in very significantly in connection first with augury, astrology, and then much more vigorously in connection with the great age of exploration and navigation. One had to know where one was in the world. And so it goes. Now what was originally pretty much an empirical experience matter, one learned by doing and the artisan was the one who could get the new metal, metallurgy and so on, the man came up from the machine to run General Motors; of course, as knowledge was developed there came a coherent body of understanding, in fact, that lead each of these to form its own area. Now, the problems that are emerging, as Joe has just emphasized, are new kinds of problems. They are much more in the psychological/sociological interactive area, and one has to bring together the resources of these other disciplines.

[redacted]

I like to think of vertical versus horizontal. I've often defined behavioral science as an effort to use these vertical disciplines in a whole set of separate horizontal coordinations: one directed to the urban problem, one directed to transportation, one directed to delinquency, one directed to drugs, whatever else you want. You use the same basic things but you use different aspects of them. This is a new way of applying science. But you don't do it by stopping ~~to think and~~ thinking going out and beating things. It's the difference between the Fabians and the Levites.

May I respond in another way, too. The structure for the preparation of the practice of medicine seems to me is, I guess, the Time Magazine story of just a few weeks ago. Emphasized really is a case where we have a real need to somehow modify the structure of the thing. What we have now, a single track system for the M.D. is really obsolete, Sir. That is, the specializations that presently prevail are such that a man really cannot achieve all these things simultaneously in that there's a place for perhaps half a dozen different kinds of programs which would be sort of specializations much earlier than now. And, perhaps, not only at the doctorate level but at the master's level, too. It seems to me that this is just a crying need in our society and the graduate schools ought to move towards encouraging this.

LLOYD

Joe, do you have any limitation on how far you would go on this? How would you determine the university level for handling this? Who checkmates the university on how far it can go?

MCCARTHY

Well, I suppose in the end, the taxpayers and the giftgivers in public and private institutions respectively. If you can't sell the product, why, the social brakes will be felt immediately.

LLOYD

Trying always to have the kind of discourse that is typically university, and if we're not careful we'll be just talking about the university discourse rather than the community. Now, as we open up from the research-oriented to the practitioner-oriented, there are various levels of training and somebody has to determine which of those the university takes on. Perhaps this isn't exactly what you had in mind, but the question of continuing education is now an important element in the true life experiences of someone who is engaged in professional practice, and I've been interested to see the development, the balance, the lack of real agreement on whether the responsibility for continued education rests, for example, with the American Medical Association or with the ex-medical school. And the answer I think is that both types of organizations are performing useful functions. And I think the same thing about these other subjects, that is, the extent to which an internship, and so on, is appropriate, and the arrangements for it are something we really haven't come to in a sense of doctorate engineering, for example.

GERARD

The university campus at Irvine inherited, a year or plus ago, a full-fledged medical school, and like Rose of Washington Square, or the reverse of it, it had a great future but not much of a past. And it is now our very own and it is a source of great excitement and interest on the campus, trying to make it into the image of what we feel it should be. The question immediately arose, well, what other activities should the campus look forward to engaging in in the health field. And, as some of you know, the University belatedly and not only under the influence of Charlie Hitch but certainly encouraged by his approach, finally explicitly acted upon what it has said for years. It is silly to have a ten-year plan for buildings and a one-year plan for what you're going to do with them. And so we are very busy trying to formulate significant academic ten-year plans which will run out ahead of the building plans. There was, therefore, created a health planning committee by the Chancellor and the University Senate. I happen to be Chairman of it and we are working very intensively for some months now to try and give a rational instead of an empirical and immediate answer to the question. We have made some tentative answers in case somebody comes at us tomorrow and says, "Well, should we have a school of nursing or shouldn't we?" "Should we have a school of optometry?" "Should we produce dental technicians?" The community pressures are all "Do everything." A representative body from each of these professional groups comes in every now and then and says, "We are desperately short of pharmacists in Southern California; we need new schools. You can get plenty of money from the government. Start tomorrow." I might do well as Dean. And we've got some answers ready for that, which I won't bore you with. But it's a very splendid committee in my judgment. Several of the key people on the campus, both intellectually and administratively, we have some of the leading systems thinkers, organization theorists in the country who happen to be respectively Director of our Public Policy Research Organization, which is something like the Denver one which is a way of bringing together the existing research skills on the campus to help solve concrete problems of a larger or smaller community; Alex Mood, some of you know him; we have one of the leading organization men in the country, Jim March, who happens to be Dean of our School of Social Sciences; we have a couple of distinguished biologists; we have the Dean of the Medical School.

DISCUSSION FROM THE FLOOR

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Wendell H. Bragonier, Colorado State University

Theme: "Changing Expectations of the Graduate Students"

address: *CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS*

by: *William J. Burke*
Dean and Vice President
Graduate School
Arizona State University

The subject of this panel discussion--Changing Expectations of Graduate Students--encompasses much more than we can hope to cover in the time allotted. However, it would not be proper or meaningful to attempt to discuss the feelings, hopes, and aspirations of graduate students as separate and distinct from those of undergraduates.

Initially then, I would like to make some observations about the attitudes of college students generally.

In the January 1969 issue of Fortune, devoted largely to American youth and problems on campus, Gregory Wierzynski reported on some 200 interviews conducted on a score of campuses. These students were described as being mainly to the left but not campus militants. He summarized their attitudes in this way:

> Our most wrenching problem is finding a place for ourselves in society. By all indexes we should have no anxieties about our future: we are told that we are the best prepared, best educated, most talented crop of students ever produced in this country. What we fear is not that society will reject us; we fear that we cannot accept society.

Present society is accused by these students of tolerating injustice, being hypocritical and insensitive, and lacking candor. Business, government and higher education are all accused of a primary interest in maintaining the status quo rather than having real concern for alleviating our many pressing problems.

Dean Franklin Ford of Harvard believes that the majority of college students are merely onlookers; he estimates that the concerned 40% includes 20% protestors, 6% militants and only 2% wreckers. In any event, it is abundantly clear that many students are not satisfied with the educational system. Then what do they want? The answers, of course, are many and varied and include both thoughtful suggestions and ridiculous demands.

In this connection we might pause for a moment to consider some of the rules in force in the middle ages at the University of Bologna, founded in the twelfth century by a corporation of scholars. In the Rise of the Universities by C. H. Haskins it is noted that at Bologna:

> A professor might not be absent without leave, even a single day, and if he desired to leave the town he had to make a deposit to ensure his return. If he failed to secure an audience of five for a regular lecture, he was fined as if absent--a poor lecture indeed which could not secure five hearers! He must begin with the bell and quit within one minute after the next bell. He was not allowed to skip a chapter in his commentary, or postpone a difficulty to the end of the hour, and he was obliged to cover the ground systematically, so much in each specific term of the year.

The desire to participate in a meaningful way in all important aspects of university life, and especially the academic process, is shared by many of the concerned students on our campuses. To do this in a constructive fashion will require unusual wisdom, patience and understanding--to say nothing of hard work on the part of trustees, administrators, faculty and students alike.

Efforts are being made in this direction in distinctive new courses being offered at the University of Utah and at the University of Texas. In Philosophy 175, taught by Dr. C. H. Monson, Jr., Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at Utah, 19 students in a variety of academic areas are being given the opportunity to generate ideas for improving the University through internal research and studies of successful programs at other institutions. The course on "Self and Campus Society" at Texas includes such topics as student participation in decision making, freedom and authority on campus, and college crises and psychological development.

In another cooperative effort, students and faculty at U.C.L.A. have been working together on a Committee for the Study of Education and Society with a view to generating new interdisciplinary courses which would meet the demands for both greater relevance and high intellectual standards. One of these courses on disarmament was developed cooperatively by Professors Raymond Orback, a physicist, and Ciro Zoppo, a political scientist. Of the eight courses approved so far under the program, the most popular has been one on corruption.

There is a definite trend toward appointing students to an increasing number of college academic committees which a few years ago were composed solely of faculty members on most campuses. Such a move is important in promoting a useful dialogue on curriculum, admission and dismissal problems, registration, grading systems, graduation requirements and other important academic matters as well as such prennial problems as parking regulations and seating at athletic contests.

Students show deep concern for the relevance of courses and the opportunities for flexibility in their majors. Many feel alienated as a result of professionalism of the faculty fostered by a reward system that favors excellence in research over that in the classroom. They desire more personalized relationships with the faculty and more opportunities for individualized instruction.

In contrast to most faculty members, students are highly motivated toward innovation. Mayor Lindsay alluded to this recently when he said:

> . . . institutions are run by men and often those who appear most eager for change oppose it most stubbornly when their own institutions are involved. I give you the university professor, a great friend of change provided it does not affect the pattern of academic life. His motto is 'innovate away from home.'

The formerly staid U. S. Office of Education has recently recognized the desirability of having student views on matters directly affecting them by appointing students to such advisory boards as those for graduate education and student financial aid.

Current trends also indicate a more active future role of graduate students in matters of direct concern to their academic programs. While relatively few Graduate Councils have student members, an increasing number of universities are adopting the policy of having students sit with the various subcommittees of the Council and in this way make their views known. This would appear to be an important move away from the conventional activities of many graduate student organizations which often concern themselves with such auxiliary interests as providing opportunities for recreation or brown bag lunches or issuing graduate student handbooks, one of which contains such vital items as where to buy booze and how to vote locally even though registered as a non-resident at the university.

Teaching assistantships provide a major means of support for graduate students, and student assistants play an important part in both the graduate and undergraduate programs. Their ambivalent role as both teacher and student creates special problems not shared by other students or faculty. To have the best of both worlds would be ideal for them; faculty rank when it comes to parking assignments, bookstore discounts or library privileges and student status with regard to social security or income tax assessments.

Of major concern to most teaching assistants is the opportunity to assume greater responsibility in all aspects of the teaching process. They resent being exploited and assigned menial and repetitive tasks. They also seek opportunities for growth in their teaching assignments, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities where many students are TA's for 3 or 4 years in contrast to an average of about a year and a half in the natural sciences, which offer many opportunities for fellowships and research assistantships. They want the opportunity to work closely with the senior faculty in designing the course, evaluating the results--aside from grading--and in uncovering and assessing new source materials.

In a recent study of 120 departments in ten leading graduate schools, Ann Heiss reported that 26% of the TA's would welcome a greater emphasis on teaching methods in their assignments, and only 59% of the TA's felt that they had been given enough guidance. They were highly critical of the "sink or swin" approach found in some departments and also of those programs in which the TA had little control over the instructional approach.

Dr. Heiss also noted a sharp distinction between dedication to a career and commitment to career. Of the 2,040 TA's studied, 6% are members of a union and another 45% said that they would join if a local were available. Only 12% said they were opposed in principle to unions. About 40% viewed unionization as a possible means of negotiating better salaries and another 40% felt that unions might lead to better working conditions, sections of limited size, and improved appointment procedures. And, interestingly enough, 13% thought that unionization could lead to improved undergraduate programs.

This study leaves little room for complacency. The implications are clear. We can no longer afford to adopt the attitude of "business as usual" regarding TA's. Steps must be taken now to make their teaching experience worthy of an introduction to the academic profession. Since each discipline has its own peculiarities and needs, the faculty in each department will have to seek out appropriate means for improving the lot of its teaching assistants. This must include proper rewards, encouragement and adequate facilities for both their teaching and research.

Yale, Columbia, and Northwestern have taken steps to improve the status of teaching assistants by devising a package arrangement which includes a limited amount of teaching along with assurance of fellowship and dissertation support over a four year period. While such programs may involve complications for public universities, we can anticipate more moves in this direction, particularly if large-scale general institutional support of the type provided for in the Miller bill becomes available.

Departments can and should define graduate programs and provide proper advisement so that most students can earn the doctorate in three to four years beyond the bachelor's degree. The close student-faculty advisor relationship so common in the natural sciences should be encouraged in the humanities and social sciences. Perhaps some imaginative new way of handling library resources might do for these areas what the laboratory does in the natural sciences in helping to bring about a close master-apprentice relationship.

The theme of this conference is Relevance of Graduate Education. Concerted attention to the relevance, reassessment, and restructuring of our graduate programs may, perhaps, provide a new set of 3 R's for education to help us meet the needs and desires of our students.

address: *CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENTS*

by: *Ellery M. Matthews*
General Manager of Las
Vegas Division
E. G. & G., Inc.

I have a particular advantage over my colleagues on the panel in that my role is as an industrialist, rather than an educator. I am a buyer of your product, not a producer. I think that gives me license to join the militant students and Board of Regents to tell you what is wrong with the university education process. I am characteristically well qualified since I know little about the subject, the data I have are distorted, and I certainly feel no personal responsibility for your inadequacies.

When I first tried to develop my thoughts on the subject of universities and graduate schools, I found myself being trapped by your rules, which frankly get in my road. Rules which say I must prepare a paper predicting what I will say, how I will behave, or how I will respond to the stimulating experience of dealing with this unknown group. To be scholarly, abstract, and proper is not my style and might get in my way of enjoying the great fun of being with you. I prefer to be more existentialistic. I expect to learn something this morning of value to me. Whether you do is your thing.

However, let me polarize things by giving my stereotyped view of graduate schools, in particular, and universities, in general.

The major university goal appears to be the production of graduates who are literate, rational, logical thinking people. This suggests the ability to have well developed skills in written communication, particularly in dealing with the language of abstraction, symbolism, and generalization. Men able to solve problems and make decisions based on intelligence, creative insight, a respect for facts, and to search for elegant solutions. Men who are committed to the great principles and ideas of our western society, and who are principally committed to the truth and the search for truth. They are expected to maintain objectivity in the face of emotional stress, and deal with difficult personal situations by explanations, theories, models, reports, and a general reliance on hard data. By and large these goals are well met by our universities and do have great value to industry, as well as to our civilization. Those individuals who have advanced degrees are expected to have these skills developed to a very high degree.

A graduate will often discover that these skills are not relevant in an action situation in industry. They find they have been trained to play the game of business in a fantasy world.

This clash with reality leads principally to two alternatives. One is to seek a cloistered sort of environment, such as university faculties, the staff of "think tanks", government, and the like. The other is to be confused for a year or two on a job, learning how to translate their abstract skills into viable tools for problem solving in the industrial environment. I am certain it is quite common in the electronics industry to expect a minimum of a year before, say, an engineer can earn his salary in terms of personal output. It is also customary to expect that any new graduate will not stay with you more than two years before moving to some other company. This suggests to me that industry is spending millions of dollars in chancy on-the-job training that might better be done by universities, if we were certain that universities understood the problem and were competent to deal with it.

This set of additional goals is in the development of inter-personal effectiveness in university graduates. Such competence displays itself in the ability to communicate openly and directly in person-to-person action situations; to understand and be tolerant of the different values and motives of others. They should expect that often times decision making and problem solving is concerned with inadequate data, unreliable and conflicting information, and that the search is for possible solutions, even though the solution is inelegant. They should not be disabled when required to make intuitive judgments because data are lacking or the problem is new. They should anticipate close working relationships with colleagues and be able to view work as fun, and not something solely to be tolerated for eight hours a day like a prison sentence. I would hope that they would view change as normal, and status quo as unnatural.

Somehow these goals must be learned without destroying the rational, logical man . . . rather supplementing that man to live a complete life in a real world. My experience would lead me to feel that industry, as a whole, fires 100 professionals because of their lack of inter-personal effectiveness for each individual that is terminated for lack of professional skills.

address: *CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENTS*

by: *James Ragin*
Ph.D. Candidate and
Asst. Prof. of Zoology
Colorado State University

When I was first asked to assemble my thoughts about the "Changing Expectations of the Graduate Students", I was immediately struck by the complexity of this topic. Today, as I attempt to bring order to the confusion of my thoughts on the subject, I am appalled more than ever before by its nebulousness.

In order to explore and assemble my thinking, I am forced to ask myself questions which seemed central to the issue: Who are the graduate students of today and how do they differ from those of yesteryear, what are the expectations of graduate students? And how are these expectations met by the departments and graduate schools?

Pioneered by Harvard, Yale, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins Universities, post graduate education in the United States is only about one hundred years old. A cursory examination of Reports of the Commissioner of Education reveals that before 1861 not a single doctorate had been awarded by an American institution; in 1890, 164 such degrees were conferred; in 1900 the number had doubled. In 1871, the total number of post graduate students in American institutions was 198; by 1890, the number had risen to 2,872. By the 1962-63 academic year there were 91,418 students seeking Masters Degrees and 12,822 working on doctorates. This tremendous growth in post graduate instruction can be attributed to some degree to the rapid growth of the population during the twentieth century and to the increasing popularity of higher education following the second World War. Yet other things have exerted a profound influence upon graduate education in the United States. Demands from educational institutions, business and government for employees with advanced work and degrees, have placed additional pressures upon college students to continue their education past an initial degree.

The graduate student of a past era could be stereotyped as upper-middle class, white males seeking a career in an academic profession. Today, this is different. The scholarship of post graduate work, was, according to President Gilman of Johns Hopkins, "designed to utilize the lecture, seminary and laboratory methods, and to bring students and teachers together in a close and congenial association."

Today, most graduate students still come from a middle class background, although more opportunities for advanced study are being opened to students from the lower socio-economic stratas of society. Very slowly, the stereotype of the graduate student is being overcome, and in the graduate schools across the land there are students from poor families and minority families. Perhaps the two most dramatic changes in graduate education have come in the areas of women in graduate school, and the growing numbers and varieties of students entering advanced degree programs for careers in areas other than college teaching. Yes, the students entering graduate schools are very different today from those of twenty-five years ago.

Even the objectives of a graduate program, as set forth by President Gilman, have changed due to the pressures of increased enrollment and orientation of the students. For no matter how desirable the objective of "a close and congenial association between teacher and student" may be, few graduate programs have this advantage.

Certainly for many students entering graduate programs today, the expected realization of President Gilman's objectives are unrealized. In the seminars, lectures, laboratories and research, they expect to find individualized programs and close association with scholarly colleagues. In most cases, these expectations are swiftly destroyed by the pressure of numbers, overcrowded seminars, uninspired lectures, limited laboratory time, routine research, lockstep course work and scholarly colleagues too busy for them. The expectations of these students follow the traditional perceptions of what graduate education should be. Yet, for an increasingly large number of students enrolling in graduate programs, their expectations are related not to scholarly endeavors, but to specific vocational and economic objectives. There is a vast difference in the expectations of the student desiring to seek knowledge in a particular field of study as contrasted to a student who seeks an advanced degree because a school district is beginning to require its teachers to hold advanced degrees.

Therefore, in evaluating the expectations of graduate students, it becomes necessary to explore the motivations for the students who attend graduate school. A student seeking to expand his knowledge will react differently to Rivlin's analysis of graduate programs than will the student whose interest simply lies in obtaining a degree. In "The Higher Learning in America" Rivlin implies that the advanced work falls under the same stress of competition and need for visible evidence of success (GPA's) as does undergraduate work; and, the same scheme of enforced statistical credits gradually diffuses into programs for advanced degrees. So these, as well as the lower degrees, will come to be conferred on the piecework plan. Throughout North American universities there are precise directives to be followed by which higher degrees are to be earned. The directives are in terms of stipulated courses of classroom work, and aggregate quantities of standard credits, and lengths of residence. This need of conformity to the standard credit requirements will therefore constrain the candidate for an advanced degree, to make the substantial pursuit of knowledge subordinate to the pursuit of credits.

Rivlin's judgment may be harsh, but it is true and a far cry from the objectives as stated by President Gilman, and in some cases, very close to the expectations of students whose sole objective is gaining a degree. Expectations of a lockstep method with the barriers of comprehensives, research papers and orals may be a horror to a scholar, but they can be comforting, if not challenging to a student wishing to better his education or vocational opportunities with yet another union card.

Generally, the response of professors, departments, and graduate schools to pressures of increasing numbers, and vocational orientation of students, has been to yield. Professors with a dozen or more graduate students are going to be hard pressed to individualize each program. A department gaining stature by the number of graduate students in its program will find it difficult to maintain a low teacher-student ratio; and a graduate school, pressed by large numbers of aspirants for degrees is going to find a great temptation to continue to provide minimum obstacles, whereby, when overcome, degrees may be conferred.

The expectations of graduate students toward their earning potential are changing daily. The elitism of an earlier period is gone. While terminal degrees are not a common commodity, the pressures of business, government, and the academic community for graduates with these degrees are forcing more people into graduate programs. Perhaps, the greatest expectation of today's student and also his greatest tragedy is the measurement of a degree in the dollars and cents medium of earning potential, rather than in the sanctity of the pursuit of knowledge.

What I believe to be accurate factual reporting concerning the do's and don'ts for a successful graduate program was published in the magazine "Careers Today."

"For men as well as women, it's smart to plan a hard, cold attack on that master's or Ph.D. Fallout is more than a pollution problem among Ph.D. candidates; they drop out at a higher rate than students in slum schools. So it might be wise to plan on picking up a master's on your way. On the other hand, a master's really doesn't mean much in some fields. It is often virtually useless in the humanities, engineering, public health, and many other disciplines but can be a big asset to teachers and business administrators.

"Talk to newly hatched Ph.D.s when picking your graduate school and ask them the following: Is the faculty responsible? Does it take care of the graduate student whose professor decides to wander to lusher campuses? (Columbia University tends to leave them orphans.) How good is the placement bureau? (Yale's is weak.) It's pretty risky to place your academic life entirely in the vernerable hands of the faculty. The three professors on your Ph.D. committee may radiate scholarly charm, but so does an owl. Dr. "A" won't bother to read the thesis you developed an incipient ulcer over, but will tell you it needs more footnotes. Dr. "B" will read it, worse luck, and want to change every sentence. Dr. "C", the faddist (he believes Queen Elizabeth wrote Shakespeare), only praises papers that spin along with his own intellectual hula hoops.

"Don't try to reform them. Their adaptability is equivalent to a 45-year-old spinster's. And don't confuse learning with degree-taking. Be idealistic about the one, practical about the other.

"Budget your time to get through the residency and course requirements and write your thesis on a self-set deadline. If it takes you over 90 days, you're wasting your time. This doesn't include research time. Draft the text as soon as you settle on a subject so that you won't do any unnecessary research.

"It's amazing how fast research material can be edited into the final draft. Be lavish with footnotes--the security blanket of the academic world."

I think graduate deans could help the graduate educational processing of students by keeping the faculty ever aware of student's changing expectations of graduate school. Some expectations are:

> That faculty will realize graduate students are not a monolithic group and that group treatment rather than individual treatment is not desirous.
>
> That curricula, where feasible, will tie in strongly with the community so that there is carryover from the graduate school to the community to which one returns.
>
> That quantitatively and qualitatively, the present narrow graduate curriculum will be rearranged to include studies of the values held by those with whom the graduate will work, socialize and live.
>
> That in some way the irrelevant obstacles placed before graduate students will be removed (e.g. two foreign languages).
>
> That the graduate school not only will prepare a student to become intellectually competent, but will prepare him with his uniqueness, for a key position in which he will serve mankind. While serving he should command a salary sufficient to live comfortably.

I don't think we, as graduate students, expect a condescending type of treatment, we merely expect the human relationship which is morally due another person who has decided to further his education.

address: *CHANGING EXPECTATIONS OF BLACK GRADUATE STUDENTS*

by: *Ernest Patterson*
Assistant Dean, Graduate School
University of Colorado

During the 1968-69 academic year many colleges and universities, because of the changing expectations of some of their students, became the focal points of alienation, disruption, dissonance, and dissent. On many campuses the struggle has become bitter, abrasive, explosive, and has assumed, in some cases, the aspects of campus civil war. The often bitter struggle frequently centers around a proposed black studies program, which has replaced Vietnam as the issue which arouses collegians. In reality, we are witnessing a black cultural revolution--a black student movement consisting of a chain of black and Afro-American student groups on college and university campuses across the country that maintain pragmatic links with inner city liberation movements. Many of them see themselves at war with white oriented college educators and administrators. However, some of these students are reformists and not revolutionists.

On white campuses the black cultural revolution caused black students to reevaluate their relative positions, as black students, in predominantly white institutions. Many felt isolated at those institutions and the reevaluation caused them to come to believe that they were conforming to standards and values that held little or no meaning for black students. They began to complain that higher education at white (and black) institutions was irrelevant and demanded that institutions of higher learning provide what they considered to be relevant education--in-depth studies of Afro-American history and culture. Reevaluation helped cause many black students to believe that institutions of higher learning were not only part of a racist society--but that racist educational institutions helped perpetuate the racist society.

Where black students were conformists in the 1950's, their awakening and newly acquired pride in being black changed their expectations and led them to demand what they believed to be more relevant education. Some insight into the new expectations and beliefs held by the black students who are leading the black cultural revolution may be gained by knowing who they admire. Many of them worship the late Honorable Malcolm X. Like him, they believe that there has been a conspiracy down through the generations to keep the truth from black men. According to Malcolm:

> It's a crime, the lie that has been told to generations of black men and white men both. Little innocent black children, born of parents who believed that their race had no history. Little black children seeing, before they could talk, that their parents considered themselves inferior. Innocent black children growing up, living out their lives, dying of old age--and all of their lives ashamed of being black. . .[1]

Leaders of the black cultural revolution are determined that their children will not be so described.

---

[1] Alex Haley (ed.), The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965), p. 181.

The vast majority in the black community has sympathy for black students and their goals. However, a few may disagree with their tactics. On the other hand, only a very small minority within the black community will publicly denounce the black students and their objectives. On the few occasions when this has happened, black students and many in the black community have viewed such spokesmen as so-called black leaders who were placed in their positions of leadership by the very Establishment which oppresses black people. Such Establishment appointed black leaders have very little, if any, communication or influence within the black community at large. Black students of the black cultural revolution refer to them as "Uncles," and believe that they are men who are convinced that their paths to success are facilitated through an adherence to white middle class values, and that they compromise their integrity as black men for material gains. They believe that this can result when a black man obtains a white-oriented education. These students' alienation cause them to believe that "Uncles" are no more than genteel niggers to the white world and that black people have never been accepted members of American society. Their mood is shifting toward acknowledging the separation that exists.

Any "Uncle" who denounces the black students' cultural revolution possibly fails to realize that black people make up more than 11 per cent of the nation's population and that it would be difficult to produce valid academic reasons why colleges and universities should not offer courses and degrees in black history, politics, culture, and literature. Degrees are granted, at some institutions, in Far Eastern studies and Russian studies. Why not a degree program dealing with the history, political, and cultural aspects of black people in this society? When Establishment appointed black leaders denounce black students for demanding social and cultural clubs, they apparently fail to remember that on many campuses Catholic students have Newman clubs and Jewish students have Hiellel clubs.

Those who become frightened when black students demand to determine whether or not certain professors teach in black studies programs may be alarmed unnecessarily. The letter from Maurice Peters, Academic Chairman, Afro-American Studies Institute, Yellow Springs, Ohio, seeking people to teach in the Institute states that they desire:

> a professional staff that in addition to possessing degrees and professional recognition by state certifying agencies, the staff must also have the good of the black community in mind and seek to develop a curriculum that not only will serve the students in the Institute, but will also serve to aid black people in the surrounding community in the development of Black economic, cultural and social liberation. Our educational philosophy accentuates the functional and problem solving aspects of knowledge.[2]

---

[2] Letters from Maurice Peters, Academic Chairman, Afro-American Studies Institute, Yellow Springs, Ohio, January 27, 1969.

If this is the demand of black students on other campuses--are they seeking autonomy for the sake of power, or are they seeking a more relevant education?

This point is especially relevant to those black students who see themselves as rebels against a hopelessly white educational apparatus which they believe trains many blacks to be enemies of their own people. Among the expectations of this group is to see the end of the traditional isolation between black students and their ghetto brothers. They expect and are willing to fight for the type of education that will help produce a new breed of black students who are willing and able to relate themselves meaningfully to the black community. Their expectations and faith in proposed black studies programs cause them to believe that restructuring of the educational system so as to include black studies will make a contribution to black people by producing students who have developed a black identity. A few also believe that by de-emphasizing white educational methods which ignore the cultural and political needs of black people, and at the same time rapidly developing black oriented curriculums, that some materialistic, brainwashed, black professionals who have turned their backs on the black community may be influenced by the products of the black cultural revolution.

Included in the expectations of black students is the anticipation that white colleges and universities will hire more black professors and administrators. They do not believe a man should be hired just because he is black, especially if he does not identify himself with black people. They realize that black people have suffered too long from betrayals and will condemn any black professor or administrator whose actions are inimical to them and the black community. Black student organizations are determined that such professors and administrators will have no utility for the administrators they serve. They will attempt to chew up and spit out black men in positions of authority who do not identify with the black cultural revolution.

Black students constitute a very small minority on white college and university campuses--usually no more than one or two per cent. Students who lead the black cultural revolution demand that college administrators admit more black students. Some of them realize that many colleges are overcrowded, but they believe that admission standards, which are kept high and which eliminate most black students, are maintained so that the white middle class assures itself the necessary space. With so few black undergraduates it necessarily follows that the graduate enrollment of black students is also critical. Fred E. Crossland, in late 1968, stated that predominantly white graduate schools of arts and sciences had a 1.72 per cent black enrollment, and that 0.78 per cent of the Ph.D.s awarded between 1964 and 1968 went to black Americans despite the fact that black people constitute more than 11 per cent of the total American population.[3]

---

[3] Fred E. Crossland, Graduate Education and Black Americans, A report to the Ford Foundation prepared by its Office of Special Projects, Division of Education and Research (New York: The Ford Foundation, November 25, 1968).

The expectations of black undergraduate students are very relevant for graduate deans. Not only will they be confronted with demands for massive and sustained efforts to make it possible for more black students to enroll in graduate schools, but many of the students who are now leading the black cultural revolution, themselves, are applying to graduate schools for the 1969-70 academic year. They will confront graduate deans with proposals to provide them with what they consider relevant educations.

However, it is highly possible that there is little reason for graduate deans to become alarmed, especially those who recognize that a problem exists and those who have considerable latitude in interpreting and shaping the direction that a graduate school will take. It appears that on those campuses where black student organizations demanded that black undergraduate enrollments be increased or in the cases of demands for black studies programs, there were no confrontations when administrators faced the issues as being academic in nature. Evidently those administrators realized that black students were underrepresented and that the study of black culture and black history had long been neglected. Also, it was possibly very easy for them to conclude that the study of black men in America is a legitimate academic endeavor.

There is evidence that forward looking graduate deans are in the process of trying to increase the number of black graduate students. This leaves them with the problem of black studies which they can intelligently approach by coordinating their programs with those responsible for undergraduate black studies programs. However, if graduate deans permit the black cultural revolution to arouse fear and hatred and resort to weapons of repression, they may error by seeking and getting a public confrontation with black students. Can anything constructive be accomplished by repression? Is oppression nearly certain to breed disorder? A graduate dean threatened with disruption on the part of student dissidents can maintain his graduate school in two ways: through creative effort or through violent repression. The two choices are available only in the initial stages of the crisis, that is, when some graduate deans may be tempted to close their eyes to the potential seriousness of the crisis. Once the destructive results of disruption have become obvious, it is likely too late for constructive remedies. There is, then, an element of tragedy in such a crisis; the disruption could be avoided by meaningful measures of reconstruction, but some graduate deans may feel there is no need for them, and when the need has become obvious, it is too late for them.

DISCUSSION

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

BUSINESS MEETING
11 a.m. Tuesday, March 4, 1969

presiding: *Wytze Gorter, President*

1. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the minutes of the Tenth Annual Meeting as published in the Proceedings.

2. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the Treasurer's report showing receipts of $1431.41, expenditures of $1503.15 and a cash balance December 31, 1968, of $2324.12.

3. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the following meeting places for the Association:

   1970 - Long Beach, California (the Queen Mary)
   (later information is to the effect that the Queen Mary may not be available until 1971)

   1971 - Seattle, Washington
   (may be interchanged)

4. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the following resolutions proposed by the Resolutions Committee which consisted of Dean William E. Umbach, Chairman; A. R. Reynolds; and Richard A. Nevè:

   I. *WHEREAS* the 1969 meeting of the Western Association of Graduate Schools was held in Las Vegas, Nevada, March 2-4, 1969, with the host institution being the Graduate School of the University of Nevada in Las Vegas,
   NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we express our appreciation to Dean Charles L. Adams, of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and Dean Thomas D. O'Brien, of the University of Nevada, Reno, who served as the committee on local arrangements.

   II. *WHEREAS* the program of the 1969 session of the Association has provided opportunity for the discussion of topics of urgent and long-range concern to those in attendance,
   NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we express our appreciation to the program committee, and in addition *BE IT RESOLVED* that we express our appreciation to those members of the Association, and especially to those participants who are not members of the Association, who gave of their time, effort, and insight to

contribute to the work of the Association and its members in the strengthening of graduate education.

III. *WHEREAS* the facilities of the Frontier Hotel have been made available to the Western Association of Graduate Schools at its Eleventh Annual Meeting and the staff has been courteous and helpful,
BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the secretary be instructed to relay to the Frontier Hotel management and staff the appreciation and gratitude for all services rendered.

IV. *BE IT RESOLVED* that the Western Association of Graduate Schools commends the work of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States in the study of designations and nomenclature of the various types of advanced study, and urges the completion of a report to be made available as a means toward reduction of existing complexities and inconsistencies in current usage and practice.

V. A reaffirmation of resolution V of the Tenth Annual Meeting supporting proposals of the Council of Graduate Schools for changes in the Selective Service Laws.

WHEREAS the situation with regard to the drafting of graduate students has not significantly improved in the past year,
BE IT RESOLVED that we reaffirm the principle expressed in resolution V proposed on March 5, 1968.

5. It was moved, seconded and carried unanimously to approve the following new members of the Association recommended by the Executive Committee:

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada
University of California, Davis, California
Portland State University, Portland, Oregon
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California
United States International University, San Diego, California

6. It was moved, seconded and carried to cast a unanimous ballot for election of the following officers of the Association presented by the Executive Committee:

President: George P. Springer, University of New Mexico
President-Elect: Philip M. Rice, Claremont Graduate School
Secretary-Treasurer: A. E. Taylor, Idaho State University
Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee for a term to end at the annual meeting in 1970 (replace Philip M. Rice): Father Harold F. Ryan, Loyola University of Los Angeles
Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee for a term to end at the annual meeting in 1971: Wendell H. Bragonier, Colorado State University

7. It was moved, seconded and carried to express to Dean Lloyd the gratitude of the Association and each of its members for his leadership as President of the Association during the past year.

8. It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the following resolution from the floor:

> *WHEREAS* there are urgent problems confronting members of particular social, economic, and ethnic groups seeking graduate education in the West;
>
> *WHEREAS* the staff of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education has expressed a willingness to assume a role in planning a regional approach to these problems in cooperation with members of the WAGS;
>
> *THEREFORE:* The Association authorizes the appointment of an ad hoc committee to explore, together with the WICHE staff, the development and implementation of appropriate regional cooperative studies and programs among members of the WAGS aimed at meeting some of the more urgent needs perceived by minority groups seeking graduate education in the West.

9. The new officers of the Association were duly installed and President George P. Springer received the gavel.

Meeting adjourned at 11:33 a.m.